

4853. 6.
7

A FULL
CONFUTATION
OF ALL THE
FACTS

ADVANCED IN
Mr. BOWER's Three Defences.

12
IN WHICH

The CHARGE brought against him is confirmed,
by a SEVENTH LETTER to FATHER SHELDON;
by an AUTHENTIC CERTIFICATE from Italy,
and MANY other demonstrative Proofs.

By the Author of the Six Letters illustrated, and of Bower
and Tillemont compared.

*Verum ubi correptum manibus vinculisque tenebis;
Tum variae illudent species atque ora.—
Sed quanto ille magis formas se vertet in omnes,
Tanto, gnate, magis contende tenacia vincla.*

VIRG.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. MORGAN, in Paternoster-row, MDCCCLVII.

COMBINATION

FACTS

Mr. Dwyer's Three Denials. 2

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been named in the above mentioned article, and who are known to the Editor of the Standard as having been connected with the case.

18



13

20

27

28

Mr.

T A B L E

O F

CONTENTS.

I NTRODUCTION -	Page 1 to 5	
<i>Mr. Bower's Account of the inquisition at Macerata falsified by the Authority of Piazza, to which he himself appeals</i> - - -	5	18
<i>Reasons for suspecting the Genuineness of the Letter which he pretends to have received from the Inquisitor Montecuccoli, Note</i> - -	11	13
<i>A Certificate of a Notary of the Inquisition at Rome, to prove that Bower never was Consultor at Macerata.</i>	19	20
<i>The Account of his leaving Italy, as told by Fathers Conyers, Lunardi, and Alticozzi, defended, and the inconsistencies and improbabilities of the Tale of his Escape, as related by himself</i> - - -	20	27
<i>Reasons for having mentioned Dr. Aspinwall's dying a Papist, Note</i> -	27	29
A 2		Mr.

C O N T E N T S

	Page	Page
<i>Mr. Bower's Money-Transaction with the Jesuits, put in a clear Light.</i>	27	35
<i>Remarkable Detection of his imposing on the Public, about taking a Bond for his Money, and about his returning to his Order</i>	35	41
<i>His moral honesty and Genius for romancing exemplified, in his intrigues and courtships---new discoveries on this Head.</i>	42	47
<i>Convicted of a plain and palpable untruth in what he relates about Martin Folkes, Esq;</i>	47	49
<i>Misrepresentation of a Charge of prophane Raillery, which he durst not deny.</i>	49	50
<i>Remarkable Contradiction of himself, with Regard to the Universal History.</i>	50	52
<i>His amazing Ignorance, or Prevarication, about the Pope's Supremacy.</i>	52	54
<i>Mental Abjuration avowed by his Practice.</i>	54	56
Arguments by which he attempts to shew the Forgery of the Letters exposed at large.		
1. <i>His absenting from Mass, no Proof of his not being a Papist.---Disguises of Papists.---Story of Commins and Heath, &c.</i>	58	62
2. <i>Would not have acted like a Fool and Madman, in Point of Intérest, by returning to the Jesuits.</i>	62	63
3. <i>His</i>		

C O N T E N T S. vii

	Page	Page
3. <i>His Solitude to get his Money from the Jesuits accounted for, by a Confession of his own.</i>	64	
4. <i>The Genuineness of the Letters not affected by their containing false facts. Do not contain any false dat. s.</i>	64	to 67
5. <i>Plea of Imprudence in writing such Letters illustrated and exposed by many striking Instances in Mr. Bower's own Conduct.</i>	67	69
<i>Remarkable Detection of his Imposture about St. Bottolph's Annuities, Note.</i>	68	
6. <i>Weakness of what he says about the Word Soli being put upon the Letters.</i>	70	
<i>His ridiculous Account of the Plot against him, and his Compliments to the Papists.</i>	71	72
New Evidence to confirm the Charge.		
<i>A Letter from Sir Henry Bedingfeld, containing remarkable Proofs that the Letters are genuine.</i>	73	74
2. <i>Mr. Bower's Connections with the Jesuits about 1746;---has been more than once at Confession.</i>	75	77
3. <i>Testimony of William Sheldon, Esq; and a Letter from that Gentleman, decisive of the Genuineness of the Correspondence between Bower and his Brother, the Provincial.</i>	78	
4. <i>A seventh Letter from A. B. to Father Sheldon.</i>	78	79
5. <i>Certificate of Mrs. Hoyles, con-</i>		
<i>taining</i>		

viii C O N T E N T S.

	Page	Page
<i>taining a full Answer to Bower's Postscript.</i> - - - - -	83	to 85
6. <i>Certificate of Mr. Faden, in Con- firmation of Mrs. Hoyles's Evidence.</i>	86	
7. <i>Ditto of Mrs. Faden.</i> - - -	87	

C O N C L U S I O N.

<i>Address to Mr. Bower's Patrons, and to himself.</i> - - - - -	87	94
--	----	----



is for the public will no longer be deceived by his
 name, and the person

I HAD been long threatened by Mr. Bower with
 an answer; and the threatened answer has, at last,
 appeared, the only one I ever expected from him,
 abuse without argument, assertions without proofs,
Jesuitical sophistry to explain away facts which could
 not be denied, and confessions and contradictions
 which betray guilt, amidst all the pretences to inno-
 cence.

Nothing that such a man shall please to do, or to
 say, when it can serve his interest, will surprise me.
 But I own it did surprise me, that he should so much
 mistake his interest, as, in his situation, and when his
 character had fallen so justly under the suspicions of
 Protestants, to brand all his opposers with the name
 of *Papists* and *tools of the Papists*; and, in particular,
 that he should be so liberal in bestowing such appella-
 tions on the author of a performance which bears
 the most signal marks of being the production of
 one called forth by a conviction, that to unmask a dis-
 guised *Papist* is to consult the honor and interest of
Protestants.

However, as this bold man hath endeavored to im-
 pose upon the unwary and the ignorant, who may be
 apt to believe any thing of one whose name they do not
 know; to put an end to his base insinuations with regard
 to the characters and motives of his antagonists, I here
 remind him of the challenge I lately gave him, and
 of my promise to publish my name to all the world,
 immediately upon his giving me the security I de-
 manded, that his pen shall be the only means made
 use of in deciding our controversy. — When once this

is done, the public will no longer be deceived by his artful misrepresentations, but find that the person whom Mr. *Bower* is pleased to describe as a *Protestant Papist* is one who has given far more convincing proofs of his attachment to the cause of the Reformation, than this outcast of the school of *Loyola*, the plagiarist of *Tillemont* and *Bruys*; that he is one whose poor abilities have been always devoted to the cause of religion and of that church of which he is a member; and one whose labors to expose the pious frauds, and superstitious pretensions of Papists, have procured to him the public thanks, and the unreserved commendation of one of the most respected writers in the three kingdoms.

Animated with no resentment, seduced by no prospect of interest, I drew aside the specious veil that art had thrown over deformity; and in displaying the real character of the historian of the Popes, my view was to do justice to a nation which he had deceived, and to serve the cause of the Reformation which such a champion would disgrace and betray. I must have renounced my senses and distrusted my understanding, if I had not formed that opinion of him which I have manifested so publicly. The same reasons which make me a Protestant convinced me, that Mr. *Bower*, long after his pretended conversion, was still linked, in the most intimate manner, with Papists. His own hand-writing in six long letters, bearing every internal mark of genuineness; the principal transaction in those letters confirmed by authentic vouchers; and a variety of collateral proofs of various kinds, being laid before me, and several other Protestants of known reputation for sense and candor who saw and believed, it would have been sceptical in me to doubt, tho' I was extremely cautious in weighing the evidence of the facts which produced conviction.

I well

I well knew, and was aware of it, to what extremities of base fraud, superstitious zeal hath sometimes led its votaries; and *Roman* forgeries were no new thing to me, not wholly unacquainted with Protestant detections of them. — But I saw nothing of this here. I saw no object worthy of such resentment, I saw no circumstances of contrivance, no marks of conspiracy. On the contrary, I saw the Papists, in general, uneasy that *Sr. Henry Bedingfeld* had opened such a scene; and the *Jesuits*, in particular, giving up with reluctance, or refusing with obstinacy, either from motives of policy respecting their body, or of prudence respecting individuals, proofs known to be in their possession, and demanded, in order to confirm the authenticity of letters, which they themselves are absurdly said to have forged. — Convinced, therefore, that *Mr. Bower* was guilty, and encouraged by the advice of respectable friends, I did not hesitate to lay before the world, those demonstrative proofs, which, I flattered myself would satisfy every impartial inquirer, as they had satisfied myself, that this nation had been most grossly imposed upon, as to the real character of the historian of the Popes.

My expectations have not been disappointed. But I own I have been greatly disappointed, to find, in the course of this debate, what I could not have imagined to be possible, that there exists prejudice so obstinate as to brave conviction, and guilt so hardened as to assert its innocence by crimes more heinous than the accusation. — This then being the case; tho' I am confident that the debate about *Mr. Bower's* character, may be rested upon the evidence already produced, I have been prevailed upon to resume the subject; not so much that I may expose to greater infamy (tho' this must be the consequence) the man himself, as that I may confound the credulity of his admirers; whose zeal, in supporting him, hath led

them, unknown to themselves no doubt, to be necessary to the perpetuating of a scene of imposture, perhaps the most impudent that can be met with in the annals of any country.

Tho' I was satisfied, in my own mind, that whenever Mr. *Bower* ventured upon making a defence, he would only plunge himself deeper into the mire, I own, I could not have conceived it possible, that he should lay himself so open to confutation, and furnish us with so striking proofs of his guilt, as I find he hath done. For tho' he had many months to digest a plan of defence and to accommodate his confessions to our discoveries, by making use of those lights, which we had thrown out, as so many Beacons to guide him in his passage between the many dangerous and narrow channells through which he was to steer, he hath not, with all his skill and circumspection, been able to escape shipwreck: and his defence, tho' it was delayed so long, had better been postponed to a longer day, as I think I have it in my power to satisfy the impartial public, that its contents serve only to confirm the charge; and to give us fresh instances of the impostures of the Author.

Indeed if I wanted any confirmation of the charge brought against this strange man, his Apology would have given it to me. The correspondence with father *Sheldon* is the capital point of his accusation; and nothing was submitted to the public, in my pamphlet, relating to his conduct, but in subordination to this principal transaction, and as a collateral proof that it really happened. When I found, therefore, that after having taken so many months to consider of what defence it might be *safest* to make, there was not a single line to disprove the genuineness of the *Six Letters*, in the huge pamphlet or rather volume which he first published; when I saw such a change made of the question, and so much art and evasion employed to
draw

draw off the attention of the reader from the point in debate, to other incidental matters, whose truth or falshood is not in the least decisive as to the principal charge—so bare faced an attempt to mislead the public, would have fixed my opinion of Mr. *Bower's* character, had it been wavering before. And every person whose judgment is determined by evidence, and whose opinions are regulated by facts, will make this remark, that his lamentable tale of the inquisition, his wonderful adventures, and plausible glosses upon particular parts of his conduct; however they may blind the eyes of prejudice and credulity, will avail him nothing unless he can shake the foundation of the charge by offering *real* evidence to detect the forgery of his correspondence with *Sheldon*.

But Mr. *Bower* has not only confirmed the charge, by omitting what he ought to have taken, first of all, into consideration, but, also, hath enabled us to detect the imposture of his character, from the very topics which he himself insists upon as the proofs of his innocence. As his bloody tale of the Inquisition seems to be his strong hold, I shall first attack him there; and I believe, the materials which I shall produce, will enable me to convince every one of my readers, that it is a *Romance* dictated by a brain regardless of truth, and falsified by the only authority appealed to in its confirmation.

Without any farther preface, therefore, I shall now take Mr. *Bower's* answer into my hands, and transcribe from it the following paragraph, which I desire the reader to peruse with attention.

“The other instance of the cruelty of the Inquisition, related in the spurious account of my escape published by Mr. *Barron*, happened some years before I belonged to the Inquisition; and I did not relate it as happening in my time; but only as *happening in the Inquisition of Macerata*. It is related

at

at length, in the Annals of that Inquisition, and the substance of the relation is as follows. An order was sent from the high tribunal at *Rome* to all the inquisitions throughout *Italy*, enjoining them to apprehend a clergy-man minutely described in that order. One answering that description in many particulars, being discovered in the diocese of *Osimo*, at a small distance from *Macerata*, and subject to that Inquisition, he was there decoyed into the Inquisition, and by an order from *Rome*, *separated as to the use of his senses*. In the mean time, the true person being apprehended, the unhappy wretch was dismissed by a second order from *Rome*, but he never recovered the use of his senses, nor was any care taken of him by the Inquisition. Father *Piazza* who was then vicar at *Osimo* to Father *Menacchi*, inquisitor at *Macerata*, and died, some years ago, a good Protestant at *Cambridge*, published an account of this affair that entirely agrees with the account I read of it in the records of the Inquisition (1).

What can be clearer and more peremptory than this? Mr. *Bower* himself reads this translation, recorded at *Macerata* as happening in the inquisition there, and Father *Piazza* has published an account of it, that entirely agrees, as Mr. *Bower* tells us, with those records.

That I may not, therefore, be thought backward in coming to a close engagement, I shall join issue with Mr. *Bower*, on this head, and call in Father *Piazza* to decide our controversy. — It is observable that my cautious Antagonist, tho' he appeals to *Piazza's* Book, leaves us quite in the dark as to its date and title. No doubt, he was in hopes that we credulous Protestants would take for granted whatever he says, without ever suspecting the truth of what he affirms, with regard to the entire agreement

(1) Pag. 18-19.

of

of the two accounts. But I, for my part, am not apt to pin my faith on any man's word; and I have lately given the world very convincing proofs, that I do wisely, in paying little regard to the affirmation of Mr. *Bower*, who, I believe, will be confounded when he is told, what he knows must prove fatal to him—that I have Father *Piazza's* book now lying before me.

By one of those rare concurrences of events which some may affect to impute to chance, but which I am not ashamed to ascribe to an all-wise Providence assisting the truth; on that very day which Mr. *Bower* will have reason to curse, in the bitterness of his heart, as being the day on which he published his answer; I say, but a few hours before I received Mr. *Bower's* Apology, a learned friend had put into my hands, a book which, from the title, (1) promised to contain matter which might assist me, in unraveling the awful web which my Antagonist had been spinning for so many months. Little did my friend on I expect, that it could furnish a total overthrow to the credibility of Mr. *Bower*. And, yet, this I found upon comparing them; and of this the reader shall now receive full demonstration.

Piazza's account of the story of the country clergyman is so particular, that the insertion of it entire would take up more room than I can spare. I shall, therefore, retain only such parts of it as are absolutely

(1) A short and true account of the Inquisition, and its proceeding as practised in *Italy*, set forth in some particular cases &c. By Hierom Bartholomew Piazza, an Italian born, formerly a lecturer of philosophy and divinity, and one of the delegate judges of that court, and now, by the grace of God, a convert to the church of England. London, printed by William Bowyer 1722. It is a thin Quarto: with a French translation opposite the English, and is dedicated, like the Book of a convert since that time, to the king.

neces-

necessary to be set in opposition to Mr. Bower's account of this affair, and refer the curious reader to the book itself, which, as being in few hands, and little known, I shall leave with my publisher, that every one, who pleases, may have ocular proof of the amazing lengths to which this man's insolent attempt to deceive this nation hath led him. And when once the following extracts, faithfully made out of Piazza's Book, are laid before the public, the invenomed, falsifying pen must drop from the hand of our Jesuit historian, and the lips of narrow-minded credulity, still opened in his support be sealed up.

Piazza from p. 18. to p. 22, gives us a description of the form of the Italian Inquisition. He tells us, that the high court of Inquisition at Rome names all the provincial Inquisitors, one for each province, who commonly resides in the capital city of the province, and sends out to every city in his province, a delegate judge or vicar. Now attend to Piazza's own words—*One of these judges, of delegate ones, I was formerly in the city of Osimo, in the province of ANCONA, near LORETTO, within the state of the Pope. My general Inquisitor, who sent me the usual letters patent, was il Padre Reverendissimo Leoni, who kept his residence at ANCONA, about twelve miles from Osimo. (1).*

Having thus heard, from Piazza himself, whose vicar he was, and under what jurisdiction Osimo is placed, I shall now abridge his long (2) account of the country clergy man, which did befall, so he expresses himself, *whilst he was delegate judge of the Inquisition of Osimo.*

The high court of Inquisition at Rome having sent circular letters to the general inquisitors, with strict orders to apprehend a certain clergyman, whose name and description were specified, and who was im-

(1) Pag. 22.

(2) It reaches from p. 34. to p. 52.

peached to have publicly taught heresies at *Venice*, *Piazza* says, that *his* inquisitor sent him a copy of the said circular letter. He mentions the diligent search he made at *Osimo*, but that it was a whole year before he could get any intelligence of him, when a man was seen by chance in the market place, who being brought before *Piazza*, seemed to answer the description of the clergyman. Upon this he examined the man upon oath, and sent an authentic information in writing to the general inquisitor, of the examination. The several questions and answers are set down by *Piazza* at full length, who committed the man to a safe custody till the return of the express, which he had sent to the inquisitor general. This being returned, the same evening, with orders to examine the man again more strictly, when he was brought before him next day, he came shaking and trembling all over, and could not be prevailed upon to speak a word, but only, *Quod dixi, dixi, quod scripsi, scripsi*. Whereupon *Piazza* sent another express to the general inquisitor acquainting him with this comical story, as he calls it, who ordered that he should bring the speechless curate to him as soon as could be. The reader is desired to attend to what follows in *Italics*, which are *Piazza's* own words — *So the poor country curate, his hands tied behind his back, was carried on barse-back, with great solemnity, as is usual on such occasions, surrounded by all the Signori Patentati, (1)*

(1) Every delegate judge or vicar of the inquisition, as well as every general inquisitor, have in their respective dioceses and cities, several officers who compose their court. — These are called in general, *Signori Patentati*, lords or gentlemen, who have letters patent of the inquisition, and are almost all of the chief nobility and gentry of the country. — As to their particular names and offices, some of them are called *Consultori*, counsellors, whom the general inquisitor, or his vicar, calls together to hear their advices, when they think fit. *Piazza*, p. 25, 26.

and their servants, in a cavalcade, I being at the head of them, from Ostia to ANCONA, where the general inquisitor resided (1). — Piazza then tells us, that all the industry, cunning, and cruelty of the inquisitor, was exerted to no purpose to make the poor curate speak, till, at last, he was found to have turned mad; and the true person being apprehended at some other place, he was set at liberty, but what became of him afterwards (says Piazza) God knows, for I never heard any news of him after this unlucky accident. — The whole story concludes with two sagacious observations of Piazza, one of which I shall transcribe, for an obvious purpose, and it is as follows. — *That we may all hence learn and observe what a mere fear can cause us sometimes to do, since it was able to turn this poor man's brain* (2).

Having thus given the fact, as related both by Bower and by Piazza, the reader will be amazed at the strange contradictions between them, contradictions of such a kind, as evidently shew, that there is a scene of imposture at the bottom; — and it will be no difficult matter to pronounce where it lies. — The contradictions are such as could not happen from any mistake, and must be owing to a determined intention to deceive. For Piazza tells us what he himself saw, and what he himself did; and Bower tells us what he himself read, recorded in the annals of the inquisition at *Macerata*, as having happened there. That both of them relate the same fact, is obvious, not only from the resemblance of circumstances, but from the appeal made to Piazza, in whose book there occurs no other story that has the least most distant affinity to this. But what puts it beyond the power of Mr. Bower to make use of this evasion, is this notorious fact, which he knows I can prove, that when he related the story in private conversation, he put the

(1) Pag. 50.

(2) Pag. 52.

same words, *Quod dixi, dixi, quod scripsi, scripsi*, into the mouth of his clergyman, which were made use of by *Piazza's*.

Which, therefore, are we to believe? The relators of this piece of history are both persons who came into this country from *Italy*, both had been priests of the church of *Rome*, both were converts to protestantism, and both made use of an inquisition scene, as the means of recommending them to Protestants. Hitherto, therefore, there seems to be an equality of credibility. But in what follows, *Piazza* must be preferred. *Piazza* is prior in time, so that he could not copy his story from *Bower*, as *Bower* might copy from him. *Piazza* tells us, that he still keeps by him his papers and certificates; Mr. *Bower*, by his own confession (1) has not a scrap of a pen to produce in

(1) "As for the letter I received from the inquisitor *Montecuccoli* — inviting me back — I cannot indeed produce it; nor any of the many letters I received from *Rome* and *Douay*. — *I have destroyed them all*". Defence, p. 47. — Is it probable that Mr. *Bower*, if he really had received from the inquisitor *Montecuccoli*, such a letter, as he speaks of, could ever think of destroying it, as it would be necessary, at all times, to preserve it as a voucher of the truth of his story? Would any man of common sense destroy the title deeds of his estate? What other estate had one in Mr. *Bower's* circumstances to boast of, but his story and escape from the inquisition, and the credit it should gain amongst Protestants? *Piazza* was sensible of this, mean as his abilities seem to be, and therefore preserved all his papers and certificates. And can we believe, that the artful Jesuit, now under consideration, could be so indiscrete (to use a favourite word of his friends) as to deprive himself of that most authentic testimony, in support of his pretensions? — Besides, when did Mr. *Bower* destroy this letter? He had it, when he was in *Cumberland*, if I can depend upon what I read in the handwriting of the eminent divine, whose copy of the account, taken by the Lady, I have published, and in the last page of

confirmation of the character he assumes; and the story he tells. *Piazza*, not long after his coming into England, printed his account of the inquisition; — *Bower*, tho' the publication of his tale must have endeared whole M. S. I find this mentioned. This then will bring down the existence of *Montecuccoli's* letter, I mean Mr. *Bower's* talk of its existence, so low, if I am not mistaken, as his assuming the character of a Protestant historian; from which period he could not avoid, if he had common sense, preserving this precious testimonial, nay, publishing it, as an effectual answer to all the calumnies which Papists might throw upon him. — But did not he shew this famous letter to several of his friends? So he tells us; but he adds, that they are now *no more*. What a pity is it, that in so important a case, when so many strong facts have been urged to shake the credit of Mr. *Bower*, every thing must be resolved ultimately, into his own *ipse dixit*? — Mr. *Bower* has Protestant acquaintance, no doubt, still alive, who have known him as long ago as those whose names are mentioned as having seen this now invisible letter. Why are none of these appealed to? — What he says of the Rev. Mr. *Aylmer's* being willing to declare, that he has often heard his father, lord *Aylmer*, speak of that letter, seems to be of little consequence. It will not even prove, that lord *Aylmer* ever saw the letter; or if his lordship did ever see it, Mr. *Bower* may well be supposed capable of producing a letter from *Italy*, to an unsuspecting friend, unacquainted with the language in which it was written, which, tho' it might pass for genuine with him, might not be so artfully contrived as to be fit to trust to the public inspection and criticism.

But if Mr. *Bower's* not being able to produce this boasted letter, is no very favourable circumstance, our suspicions against its genuineness are greatly strengthened by the description he is pleased to give of it. It was signed, he says, by *J. Montecuccoli*. I wish Mr. *Bower* had been pleased to tell us what this *J.* stands for; it being well known, that most of those names, which in *English* begin with an *J.* are spelled in *Italian* with a *G.* as *Giovanni*, *John*; *Giesuita*, *Jesuit*. — It is observable also, that the surname of this inquirer is not, so far as I can find, ever spelt, as Mr. *Bower*

endeared him to Protestants, and made his fortune, smuggled it only in select companies of Friends; and never would have submitted it to public examination, had he not been forced to do it, thirty years after, when strong suspicions of imposture falling upon him, his silence would have been construed into a consciousness, that his inquisition adventures could not bear the light. — These circumstances being weighed, favour greatly the credibility of *Piazza*, in preference to that of *Bower*. But when we take this also into our consideration, that *Bower* himself appeals to *Piazza*, as a voucher of one of the remarkable facts which he relates; and, as giving an account of that affair that entirely agrees with what he read in the records of the Inquisition at MACERATA; whatever the general authority of *Piazza* may be, which might give it, *Montecuccoli*, but *Montecuculi*. So the famous general of that name wrote it, so I read it in my moreri, and in many histories to which I have turned. I have seen it sometimes, indeed, with a double l; but, I believe, no body ever saw it, but in Mr. *Bower*'s book with a double c, followed by an o. — If any one should think this criticism too minute, and allow Mr. *Bower* to solve this difficulty, by calling it a slip of his pen, or an error of the press (an error, however, adhered to, as often as he mentions the name) I am afraid the reader, acquainted with the *Italian*, and accustomed to see the subscriptions of natives of that country, will challenge him to produce an instance, when the Christian name, is subscribed only with the initial letter. I have examined many *Italian* subscriptions, and invariably find, that an *Italian*, if he has but one Christian name, signs it always at full length; and I have asked natives of that country, who assure me, that this custom prevails. Had I no other proof of this dauntless man's impostures, this circumstance would create doubts: but when taken into consideration, along with the accumulated evidences of his arts and contrivances, so well authenticated, it will, in the opinion of the sensible and learned reader, have no small weight to prove, that no such letter ever came from Italy.

require

require some discussion, this establishes him as an unanswerable evidence to authenticate, or to overturn, whatever *Bower* shall say on that head.

Here then, we must be amazed at the unparalleled effrontery of Mr. *Bower*, who, in order to accommodate the story of the country clergyman, related by *Piazza* to his purpose, has ventured to contradict the notoriously established jurisdiction of the inquisition; and to tell us that *Osimo* is subject to the jurisdiction of the inquisitor of *Macerata*, when *Piazza*, to whom he appeals, and who was vicar at *Osimo*, says expressly, that it was subject to the inquisition of *Ancona*. But if this be a stretch of falsehood, as inconceivable as it is certain, how must our surprize increase, when we find Mr. *Bower* constitute father *Piazza* to be vicar of *Montecucoli*, of *Macerata*, when *Piazza* calls himself the vicar of *Leoni*, inquisitor of *Ancona*? And how striking a demonstration have we of the imposture of our historian, and of the falsehood of his inquisition tale, when we see him lay the scene of this poor clergyman's sufferings in the inquisition of *Macerata*, when *Piazza*, to whose authority he appeals, tells us so expressly, that he himself, at the head of a cavalcade, carried this poor man, with his hands tied behind his back, from *Osimo* to *Ancona*, where the general inquisitor resided (1).

So

(1) If Mr. *Bower* can have the amazing assurance to falsify the capital parts of this story, the reader will not be surprized to find him altering it in other particulars. Thus, though *Piazza* tells us expressly, that it was mere fear, which turned this poor man's brain, *Bower*, to heighten the colouring, tells us, that he was so racked, as to lose the use of his senses. Mr. *Bower*, by his alterations from *Piazza*, gives internal marks of the imposture of his own account. He says, he read this account, in the records of the inquisition at *Macerata*: Now is it likely, that any tribunal would put its own blunders and mistakes upon record?—Another blunder

hath

So impudent and total a departure from truth in the relation of this matter, attended by such circumstances, as to preclude the plea of mistake, was necessary, otherwise Mr. *Bower* could not have been able to bring the country clergyman to the inquisition at *Macerata*, to be tortured there. *Macerata* was the place of Mr. *Bower's* residence; an inquisition scene at *Ancona* could not, therefore, be for his purpose; and he could not otherwise accommodate the relation of *Piazza* to his own situation, but by such impostures, and falsifications, as could not even have been expected from one, who seems to make the truth of his assertions the last consideration which enters into his mind. If light and darkness be the same, if *Leoni* and *Montecucoli* be the same, if *Ancona* and *Macerata* be the same, if *torturing* and not *torturing* are the same, then, but not till then, will Mr. *Bower* be able to extricate himself out of this labyrinth, and escape safe from a precipice more dangerous than that miraculous passage of the *Alps*, which makes so shining a part of his *True* history.

What this prodigy of a man may now have to say, when he stands so remarkably convicted of imposture, by the very authority to which he appeals, and what reasons his credulous admirers will assign why they should still persist in encouraging this man to attempt farther, and more criminal, impositions on this insulted nation, I protest I cannot see. The only thing that can be urged, is the strange improbability that he should *falsify*, in an instance, where he himself furnished the means of detection. But the fact, however improbable, is certain; and the very improbability hath unfortunately escaped him.---Where did he learn, that the man *never* recovered the use of his senses, and that the inquisition took no care of him afterwards? Was this also recorded in the annals?---As much, I am persuaded, as any part of the story.

which

which removes the suspicion, is a motive with a bad heart, for attempting a piece of villainy. Besides, Mr. Bower knew, that *Piazza's* book is in few hands, and so obscure, that there seemed little danger of its being examined upon this occasion. Indeed, it could never be much known; for the title page bears the name of no bookseller or publisher; which makes it probable, that the copies never reached beyond the hands of a few subscribers, or acquaintance.—But had it been better known than it is, let not any one wonder that *Bower* should make such use of it. He who could be capable of transcribing his history of the ancient popes from *Tillemont*, an author in the library of every learned man, and yet so impudently boast of his paying no regard to moderns, may well be supposed capable of assisting his invention, by borrowing an old tale, from an obscure *Italian*, and of serving it up, new modelled, for the entertainment of those, of whose credulity he had the strongest proofs. Nor was this step of Mr. *Bower* so impudent, or extraordinary as, at first sight, it may be thought. He had not only his own sagacious experience of the capaciousness of our swallow, to excite him to try any experiment, how much might be fairly digested by us, but he had the example of other gentlemen in his situation to plead, who seem to be of opinion that their character of converts covers a multitude of sins, and gives them an unlimited privilege of exposing to Protestants, the errors and frauds of *Popery*, without paying any scrupulous regard to truth in the facts they relate.—Not many years before the worthy convert, whose fame I have taken some pains to extend, came into this country, *Antony Gavin*, a *Spanish* priest, who, like our hero, had abjured in his mind the tenets of his former religion, in *Spain*, and escaped also, like him, to *England*, published his *Master-key of Popery*. Willing to serve his new friends, to the extent of his abilities, this modest

and

and conscientious convert, made no scruple to swell his volumes with common place romantic stories of the lewdness and irregularities of priests and nuns, adapted by him to his purpose, and represented as having happened at *Saragosa*, and other places in *Spain*, where he had resided. And, such was his strict adherence to truth, and his opinion of *English* good breeding prompting them to acquiesce in any thing affirmed to them by one of his character, that he did not hesitate to assist his invention from the *Decameron* of *Boccace*, and to entertain his Protestant readers with an old *Italian* novel, as a modern true history (1).—And if this was permitted to *Gavin*, who can be so ill natured as to refuse the like indulgence to *Bower*? And as the *Spanish* priest had, by such collections, furnished out a luscious banquet for the public, what reason could our *Macerata Jesuit* have to be afraid of hazarding an inquisition scene or two, equally authentic, in select companies of believing admirers?

And now having demonstrated (I may use the word) the imposture of Mr. *Bower*, in this remarkable part of his story, I appeal to every reader, who is a judge of evidence, whether this detection ought not to be decisive as to the whole controversy about his character, and whether one, so clearly convicted of a deliberate design to impose upon the public, can have the least right to expect that credit can be paid to any thing which he asserts?—Though, therefore, I will not take upon me to say that Count *Vincenzo*

(1) The third novel of the third day of *Boccace*, the scene of which is placed at *Florence*, and in which we have a story of a lady who artfully made her confessor the means of procuring her a gallant, by sending him to dissuade a gentleman from an intrigue with her which he had never thought of, may be read in *Gavin's* first volume, the capital circumstances preserved, but said to have happened in *Spain*, in his time; and to please his readers, he makes the lady's favorite to be an *English* officer. Other instances might be particularized, but one is sufficient.

D

della

della Torre (1) was no more tortured to death in the inquisition at *Macerata*, than the country clergyman; this I must insist upon, that till it be confirmed to us by other testimony besides that of the plagiarist and falsifyer of *Piazza*, no kind of regard can be paid to it (2).

(1) To shew the improbability of the story of *Vincenzo della Torre*, as related by Mr. *Bower*, suffer me again to call in the evidence of *Piazza*. From him we learn, as I have quoted him above, that the office of the *Consultori* or counsellors, one of which *Bower* calls himself, is to give their advice to the inquisitor, or his vicar, when they think fit to call them together. Is it at all likely, therefore, that *Bower* should be obliged to be present at the torturing of prisoners, when his office was, not that of a judge, but only to give advice, if asked? Besides, *Piazza* tells us, p. 22. that he was judge of the Inquisition at *Osimo* for some years; and yet we read p. 94, 'Here the reader may be desirous to know how the execution of the rack is performed in the inquisition of Italy. To say the truth, neither had I occasion of being present at such a barbarous execution, nor was I curious of seeing so pitiful a sight'. After reading this evidence of *Piazza*, what opinion can we have of the word, or of the humanity of *Bower*, who tho' he was not a judge, but only a consultor, in three or four years, pretends to have been not only eye witness of, but accessory to the perpetration of cruelties, which cannot, even in his unanimated narration, be read without horror?

(2) As Mr. *Bower's* escape happened soon after his friend's tragical end, he could not know whether the widow proved with child. But I make no doubt of this, for I have in my possession a letter from a native of *Macerata*, now in *England*, who being, last year, at *Macerata*, saw the Count *della Torre* at that place. Indeed he adds that the present Count is son not of a Count *Vincenzo*, but of a Count *Louigi*. But this difficulty, and every other, relating to Mr. *Bower's* tale, will, in all probability be soon cleared up. As the matter stands, at present, even though we cannot positively contradict it, we cannot, without credulity, believe it; its credibility hanging solely on the word of one whose evidence, after what hath been said, must pass for nothing.

But

But if Mr. Bower's assertions must all be disregarded, even when we cannot contradict them, the reader, who hath seen the amazing lengths to which his genius for romancing hath led him, will be disposed to receive with more attention, *positive testimony* produced to overthrow the unsupported affirmations of so bold a man. With this view, therefore, I shall lay before the world an *authentic certificate*, which the impartial reader will peruse with satisfaction, and Mr. Bower, hardened as he is, must read with shame. The original, sealed with the seal of office, is now in my possession; hath been perused by many persons of eminence, and is ready to be produced for any one's satisfaction. Sir Henry Bedingfield, having written to Italy to have the assertion in the Letter (1) from ITALY, *that Mr. BOWER never was counsellor of the inquisition at MACERATA*, authenticated, received the following certificate, the translation of which I shall put at the bottom of the page.

(2) **FIDEM facio, per presentes, ego S. Romanæ & universalis Inquisitionis notarius infra scriptus, qualiter diligenter perquisitis Registris Patentatorum S. Officii Anconæ, inveni P. Archibaldum Bower, societ. Jesu, natione Anglum, nunquam fuisse, neque esse consultorem pro dicto S. Officio Anconæ in civitate Macerateni.**

(1) See Six letters illustrated, p. 85.

(2) I the under written notary of the holy Roman and universal Inquisition do, by these presents, certify, that having diligently searched the registers of the *Patentati* of the inquisition of *Ancona*, I have found that father *Archibald Bower*, of the society of Jesus, and an Englishman, *never was and is not now* a counsellor for the said holy office of *Ancona*, in the city of *Macerata*. --- In witness whereof, given at *Rome*, from the palace of the said holy Inquisition this 4th. day of September 1756. Signed, *Eusebius Ant. Calabrinus*, Notar. in fide to the holy Roman and universal Inquisition.

precipices, merely because the horrors of the death of his friend made an impression upon his mind? Why, instead of this desperate step, did not he lay down his office in the inquisition, fairly and above board? What suspicion could this fix upon his character? And if *he was not yet determined to quit either the church of Rome, or his order*, why did he not apply to his own superiors, to whom he owed stricter obedience than he possibly could to mylord *Montecuccoli* the inquisitor, to be removed from *Macerata* to some other college, by which removal his inquisitorial consultorship would have ceased of course? He tells us, p. 79, *that the Jesuits are in their hearts rather enemies than friends to the inquisition*, is it likely, therefore, that they could have had any aversion to comply with the desire of their member, to get rid of all connexion with that tribunal? — In answer to what I now urge he will, perhaps, tell us, that having once accepted his letters patent from *Montecuccoli* he durst not send them back. But that he might do this without danger, and not without a precedent, is evident from the case of his good friend *Piazza*, whom he will, once more, tremble to see produced; and who tells us, *that not being well pleased with his employment that obliged him to persecute his Christian brethren --- he sent back again to the general inquisitor his letters patent, and resigned his office, waiting only for an opportunity of bidding farewell to Italy, and coming among the Reformed and Protestant people* (1). If, therefore, father *Piazza* (a member of the same inquisition of *Macerata*, with Mr. *Bower*, if Mr. *Bower* himself is to be believed, or rather a member of the

could only retard his escape, create suspicion, and endanger his safety; whereas eight days, well employed on the great road, would have carried him beyond all danger.

(1) Pag. 24.

same

same inquisition of *Ancona*, if *Piazza's* own word, and *Calabrinus's* authentic certificate, are to be credited) I say, if *Piazza* acted thus, can any one suppose it to be possible, that our hero should endanger his life, in order to get free from an office, which it appears to be customary to resign at pleasure?

It is obvious, then, to every discerning reader, from *Bower's* own representation, that he hath not told us the real cause of his withdrawing from *Italy*. But this defect hath been supplied, by some of his former acquaintance; and in a letter, published in my first pamphlet, the original of which is safe where the letters to *Sheldon* are, we have the whole scene laid open by the evidence of fathers *Lunardi*, *Allicozzi*, and *Conyers*.---No wonder, that every shuffling evasion, and all the arts of chicane should be employed by him, to disprove the authenticity of such a letter so unfavourable to his reputation, and unfolding truths not to be trusted to the profane ears of Protestants. But an effectual answer to his long comment upon it, may be given, in very few words. The principal topic made use of by him in contradiction to it, is this that by the papal bulls (1), the seduction of a penitent by her confessor is not cognizable by the inquisition, unless he solicit her in the *confessional*. But had he thought himself under any obligation to state this matter agreeably to the truth, he would have admitted, what is well known amongst those of his former profession, and amongst those who look into the *Romish*

(1) As a proof of the industry and exactness of Mr. *Bower*, the reader may observe that he knows nothing of the popes bulls referred to but what he reads in Limborch, whom he quotes, on the occasion. This is the man who promises to *detect* the mysteries of the inquisition; and yet, has no materials for such a detection but what every Protestant knew, before our convert brought his valuable discoveries to *England*.

canonists,

canonists, that the papal bulls concerning the solicitation of penitents, have received this interpretation, that seduction in a *cloister* should be looked upon as amounting to seduction in the *confessional*; because a confessor is supposed to have no business with a cloistered nun but to confess her (1). — But allowing this to be a doubtful point, hath Mr. Bower offered any thing to prove that he did not actually solicit this nun during the very act of confession? Far from doing this, he on the contrary, admits that the charge might possibly be true, by owning that he had been appointed for some little time, *confessor extraordinary* (2) to the nunnery in which she was, and that *in all likelihood he heard* (3) *her confession* (4). — Indeed this conformity between his confession and his accusation, and his acknowledging that he was *acquainted with*, and *visited* Donna *Francesca Eleonora Buonacorsi* (we are obliged to him for her names) can serve only to confirm every capable reader in the truth of the whole story as related in the letter from *Italy*, whose

(1) Tho' the authority of *Gavin* be of little weight when cited as a voucher for facts, perhaps he may be allowed to be so far an authority as to satisfy us what is the practice of the church of *Rome*. As a proof therefore, that the solicitation of a cloistered nun, by a confessor, comes under the cognizance of the inquisition, I shall refer the reader to *Gavin's* first volume where we have two cases of this kind related; the first p. 270. of friar *Joseph* and *for Mary*, and the second p. 300. of father *Pueyo* confessor of the nuns of *St. Monica*, who had debauched five of his spiritual daughters.

(2) Pag. 55.

(3) Pag. 56.

(4) Mr. Bower's appointment to be confessor extraordinary, to this nunnery, gave him a right to be called the ghostly father of those nuns, which title every confessor, whether ordinary or extraordinary, has from his penitent.

authen-

authenticity he will find it as difficult to disprove, as it will be to demonstrate the forgery of his own letters to *Sheldon*.

Enough having been said to prove that Mr. *Bower* hath not told us the real motive of his escape from *Italy*; I beg leave now to point out some of the striking inconsistencies between the wonderful narrative of his journey as it hath now come from his pen, and as it formerly came from his mouth. --- When the Ladies account (1), with which I lately favored the public, is compared with what we read in Mr. *Bower's* defense, there will be found an exact conformity between them in every fact mentioned by both, not only as to the substance but as to the very words. From this, therefore, we are warranted to infer that she was equally careful in recording those adventures of our traveller, which we find omitted in the account to which he sets his name. The Lady seems to have all the compassion and all the faith too of every curious female,

(1) Mr. *Bower* is pleased to affirm that he hath a copy of this narrative, in which there is no date mentioned from the beginning to the end. In answer to this I shall only observe, that the M. S. of the learned divine which I copied, is still at my command, and ends with Mr. *Bower's* landing at *Dover* on the 11th. of *July* 1732. --- It concerns not me to give any answer to what he says about the improbability of his giving a false date. The motives of a bad man to depart from truth, being best known to his own depraved heart. However, he who was capable of braving out a contradiction about the date of his leaving the *Papists* charged upon him by his antagonist, by calling a mistake of four years --- a slip of his pen, or an error of the press, may well be supposed capable of contradicting himself as to another date, and I would recommend it to him to make the same satisfactory defense. --- See *Bower's* answer to a new charge, p. 13.

Imma

Immo age, & a prima, dic, hospes, origine nobis
Infidias, inquit *Danaum*, *casusque tuorum*
 Erroresque tuos —

And he has all the modesty of an ancient hero: tho' if her account be true, it came with the latest; he reserved it for his second narrative to the public, in which we find omitted those few heroic touches,

— ' Those hair breadth scapes, of which
 ' to hear

• Old *Desdemona* seriously incline:

As where like *Aeneas*, he found the fame of his exploits and sufferings had run before him into the mountains of *Switzerland*, and even to the shores of the ocean, amongst a people of whose language he did not know the sound tho' it was his own native one,

— ' *Quis jam locus*, inquit, *Achate*!

• *Quæ regio in terris, nostri non plena laboris*—

— Where like *Bajazet*, in excess of gratitude and humanity, he would not turn his back upon the foe in full pursuit, till he had settled a pension and *fine* cure upon his horse, that faithfull companion of his travels, with the *Tartar* at his heels.—And where like *Cæsar*, with his *bagage perdu*, and given up to plunder, he was for crossing the ocean in a skiff; but the poltron of a waterman was afraid to trust himself to the seas in an open boat, tho' he carried *Bower* and all his fortunes.

But tho' these and other particulars recorded by the Lady, are now omitted in Mr. *Bower's* narrative which he hath submitted to public inspection, for reasons very obvious to every reader who can distinguish Romance from real history; they will scarcely deserve our notice, when we take into our consideration a part of his tale now, for the first time, revealed to Protestants. I mean his being at *Douay* with the

Scotch Jesuits, above six weeks, after his escape from *Italy*. — Here we have a remarkable proof of the modesty of the man. He saw from what I had dropt in my pamphlet, that his being at *Douay*, and his riding away with the horse from thence, were facts which could no longer be concealed. The inconsistency between this, and what he had invariably related, of his stopping no where between *Strasburg* and *Calais*, much less at a college of *Jesuits*, would have confounded any other person but our intrepid historian; who hopes still to preserve his credit, tho' detected, in a most remarkable instance of falsification, by telling us, that he promised the *Scotch* rector at *Douay*, to take no notice, after his arrival in *England*, of his being privy to his flight, or of the general's letter to him, lest the inquisition should have resented it severely on both (1). — Is it possible that such an evasion, can be received but with indignation? After Mr. *Bower*, for near thirty years, hath been amusing Protestants with a circumstantial account of his escape, and of the dangers he encountered; at last, upon finding the authenticity of his tale attacked by a discovery that he had taken a college of *Jesuits* in his way, he owns the deceit he had put upon us before, and thinks to bring himself off, by pretending a promise he made of secrecy. Can any one hear such pitiful shifts with patience? — If this pretence of a promise not to tell the truth, induced him to conceal one of the most important transactions of his journey, what security can he give us, that we have got the truth, from him, even now? — I shall only add, that this shuffling, ridiculous evasion of a promise made and observed, to say nothing of *Douay* or the rector of the college there, comes with a very ill grace from one who has made no scruple (I say what I can prove) to break through the most sacred obligations to se-

crecy, and entertain his companions by disclosing what he had heard in confession, from his penitents.

Mr. *Bower's* long history of his inquisition adventures, and of his escape into *England* having been examined, as a specimen how far his credibility, may be depended upon, I come now, to take under my consideration the *only* part of his first apology, which hath any immediate connexion with the charge brought against him, I mean what relates to the *money transaction*, which, however important, could be allowed only a few pages of 132, that room might be left for what, it seems, he thought a more capital point --- the vindication of his friend Dr. *Aspinwall* (1). But, however, Mr. *Bower* may shuffle over, and disguise this curious

(1) My assertion that Dr. *Aspinwall* died a Papist, hath been contradicted by two witnesses produced by Mr. *Bower*. But, admitting that their evidence hath fully acquitted the doctor, will it follow that the charge brought against Mr. *Bower* is false? He who can be so weak as to draw this conclusion, doth not deserve an answer. The sensible and candid reader will draw a very different consequence, and be of opinion that *Bower's* vindication of *Aspinwall* is unfavorable to the supposition of his own innocence. For when he pleads his own cause he offers nothing to invalidate the strongest evidence of guilt, but evasive shuffle or unsupported denial, whereas when he pleads the cause of his friend he comes up to the point, and produces the testimony of two witnesses to contradict the alleged fact. — I could wish Mr. *Bower* would do as much in his own vindication; in which case I would pardon the repetition of that scandalous billingsgate he has put into the mouth of the woman; because that, in his case, there might be some little excuse, my charge on him being a detection; in his female defender of Dr. *Aspinwall's* memory, none at all, because I only repeated a story in every body's mouth, and generally believed.

That this story of Dr. *Aspinwall's* dying a Papist hath been public, ever since he died and never, till now, con-

a curious and interesting part of his story, from what I shall now offer, it will appear that the money transaction, as it really happened, will bind this *Proteus* fast, in spite of all his turnings, and evasions; till we see

contradicted, any one may satisfy himself who will enquire as I have done, from those of the clergy of our church who were his contemporaries and acquaintance. That Dr. Middleton believed it, I already observed, and I again repeat, that he took notice of it in his letter to Mr. *Venn*. And as a proof that there are clergymen still alive, who had the same belief, I here appeal to that worthy divine of high rank in our church, whose testimony Mr. *Bower* makes use of, in p. 100; and whom I would desire to recollect whether, on December 1755, before *Bower's* connexions with the *Jesuits* were discovered to Protestants, Dr. *Aspinwall's* having died a Papist was not the subject of discourse at the chaplain's table at St. *James's*, and mentioned by two of the chaplains then in waiting? I would farther desire him to recollect whether, upon his meeting Mr. *Bower*, next day in St. *James's* park, and asking him about this, Mr. *Bower* did not tell him, that it was indeed talked of at the time, but that the report had its rise from this, *that the dutchess of Norfolk's* priest knocked at Dr. *Aspinwall's* door, and was going up stairs while the doctor was dying? Had this worthy divine recollected what passed in this conversation with Mr. *Bower*, we should not have seen him brought to declare, that he never heard it suggested by any one that Mr. *Bower* attended Dr. *Aspinwall* in his last illness, but Mr. *Barton* only, till he saw it in print. For I here affirm upon the authority of another worthy divine, who was present and heard all that passed, that Mr. *Bower* did then mention that he was with Dr. *Aspinwall*, or attended him, in his last illness; (for I use the words as synonymous, and I beg the reader will take notice of a most remarkable instance of *Bower's* fraud who in order to give to the word *attended* a meaning which I did not dream of, has changed it p. 113. into the word *assisted*). Had the whole of this conversation been so related as it really happened, it would not only have shewn that the report of *Aspinwall's* dying a Papist was public, amongst the clergy of the church of *England* before this controversy about *Bower* began;

see him stand confessed, in his own natural shape, a penitent *Jesuit*, courting the friendship of his order, and giving them the highest proofs of a sincere desire to obtain forgiveness.

That the historian of the popes, who, had been supposed to have bid adieu to *Popery* and *Popish* connexions from the moment he arrived in this country began; but it would also have shewn that it had its rise from a very suspicious circumstance, even as stated by *Bower*.--- However peremptory the testimony of Mrs. *Dechamps* be, I shall beg leave to make two remarks upon it. First; why was Mrs. *Aspinwall* so curious to see what passed between Dr. *Aspinwall* and Mr. *Bower*, when he was first introduced to him, as to post herself and Mrs. *Dechamps* behind a glass door, if at that time, she had no suspicion in her mind of her husband's *Popish* inclinations? Secondly, how can Mrs. *Dechamps* be so positive that no body came, or offered to come near him during his last illness, but persons whom she knew and were known to be Protestants, when it appears from *Bower's* own pamphlet that he was with him the very day he died, or the night before? How could she know *Bower* to be a Protestant who by his own account of himself, had made no public abjuration of *Popery*?—I shall only add farther, that tho' I should be glad to find the public of opinion that Dr. *Aspinwall* is compleatly vindicated, it is unfortunate for his memory, that the only clergyman of the church of *England* who was with him in his last moments, was Mr. *Barton* a convert, whose character I leave to be enquired into by those who knew him in the parish of *St. Ann's*, and Mr. *Bower* a priest and *Jesuit* who, if he really had left his old religion, was still at a loss for another. For tho' he quotes his share in the *historia Literaria* as a proof he was then a Protestant in his heart, every one will see the fallacy of this, who recollects that *Bower* put no name to any thing he wrote in that journal, and that as he was paid by a Protestant bookseller to give accounts of books to Protestants, himself keeping out of sight, he will never be able to satisfy any one that he might not do this, and yet be a Papist, or have no religion at all. He should remember that his brother-historian *Brux* was also a Protestant journalist.

try,

try, should after he had been in England at least 15 years, continue to be so closely connected with the *Jesuits* (1), as to put his money into their hands, and accept of an annuity from the body: this, when first talked of last winter, was looked upon to be a fact of so decisive a nature, that if this single point could be authenticated, every one seemed to be of opinion that no other proof was necessary, to confirm the genuineness of the *Six Letters*. --- Unfortunately for Mr. *Bower*, the books of an eminent *Banker* were mentioned as bearing evidence upon this occasion; so

(1) The discovery of this money transaction hath laid Mr. *Bower* under a necessity of making some confessions, which few Protestants I believe were acquainted with before. For now he tells us that after his arrival in England he continued a member of the church of Rome, and consequently of the order to which he belonged, and that he complied under the direction of father Parker then provincial with all the duty of the order, according to the vows he had made, p. 30. But it seems this fit of obedience only lasted four or five month. However, even after Mr. *Bower* had quitted his order, we are now told, for the first time, that he lived upon good terms with the *Jesuits*, was visited by them and returned their visits: --- for he had great obligations to them and knew many of them to be men of merit, p. 76. Such an intercourse between an apostate *Jesuit* and his former brethren is some what uncommon. But Mr. *Bower* who saw himself forced to confess that he had trusted them with all his fortune, could not avoid telling us that he kept up an intimacy with them. --- Nor let any one think this confession inconsistent with his tale of the attempt to carry him off from Greenwich: happy in an invention never at a loss to reconcile contradictions, he hath hit upon an admirable expedient, telling us that he did not apprehend any danger from his own order, but from the friars and secular clergy. Which is just the same as if a deserter from his Majesty's foot guards should not be afraid of associating with his old corps, but dread to be taken up by the emissaries of some Irish regiment to which he never belonged.

that

that, unable to deny that the transaction had happened, all he aimed at, was, by disguising and misrepresenting its circumstances to obviate the consequences which, at first sight, every sensible Protestant, it was natural, would draw from it. Hence, then all those lame defences, taken notice of in my first pamphlet, made use of by Mr. *Bower*, and his friends, from his mouth, that tho' he had put his money into the hands of Mr. *Hill* the *Jesuit*, he did not know that *Hill* acted in this affair as agent to the provincial of the order. And so averse was our worthy historian to have this affair examined to the bottom, that, when asked what security he had for his money from *Hill*, he pretended to three gentlemen of sense and learning, who have made no secret of what passed on that occasion, *that he had forgot*. --- This miserable account of the affair, however retailed in conversation, was not thought well enough digested to be submitted to the public; and the entire silence of Mr. *Bower*, as to the transaction, both in his *affidavits*, and in the *remarks upon the Six Letters*, is a most convincing proof that, in his own opinion, the light, in which he had affected to represent it, could give no satisfaction.

Upon the publication of my first pamphlet, the entire falshood of Mr. *Bower's* plan of defense was demonstrated. For when the public were put in possession of the extracts from father *Hill's* book, which mention the money as paid to *Sbireburn* of Mr. *Bower's* receipts in which the names both of *Sbireburn* and of *Sheldon*, are mentioned by him, as the persons who pay him the annuity; and of the entries of Mr. *Wright's* books tallying with those receipts; when the public, I say, had this chain of evidence laid before them, there was not the least room left for *Bower* to continue his ridiculous plea of ignorance; and that the money transaction was *knowingly* entered into between him and the superior
of

of the order which he had abandoned, could no longer be denied; nor is it denied, in the pamphlet now under consideration. --- Indeed we may still observe, how willing he is to delude his readers, by saying that *this money transaction began with Mr. Hill, was carried on with Mr. Hill, and with Mr. Hill did it end* (1). But all this is admitted. The point he ought to speak to, is, whether he did not know that *Hill* acted in this affair as the agent of fathers *Shireburn* and *Seldon* the provincials. He evades saying any thing of this, in direct terms. But in spite of all his miserable chicanery, he is forced to own it in effect, when he says *that it matters little whose bond or security he had for the payment of the interest*, p. 110. The whole transaction, therefore, as I had related it, standing avowed, at least uncontradicted, I shall now beg leave to make a few remarks, which, I believe, will put this matter in a clearer light, than Mr. Bower would choose to have it represented in, to Protestants (2).

Let me, then, ask this plain and obvious question; can there be a greater instance of confidence, than that which our worthy convert put in the body of the *Jesuits*, by accepting of an annuity from their provincial? Mr. Bower knew perfectly well that, as a

(1) Pag. 103.

(2) Mr. Bower says that he spoke of this money transaction to lord *Aylmer*, and to a sea commander, and that they blamed him only for *indiscretion*. Upon this I would only observe that tho' it was likely enough he might speak of his having had such a transaction with *Hill*, it is not at all likely that he explained the affair as it really happened. Mr. Bower's prevarications about it, last year, his pretending that he had forget what security he had, and now his evading an answer to the point, whether he did not know that *Hill* acted for the body of the *Jesuits*, are strong circumstances to make it probable, that he never did fairly relate this matter to any Protestant friends.

Jesuit, father *Shireburn* could have no property; that his personal bond, therefore, or the bond of *Hill*, his procurator, was in itself no such security as could be the foundation of a money bargain. Nay, even the sum of money itself paid to *Shireburn*, by *Bower's* own confession, was not secured for the payment of the interest, he having, as he tells us, transferred his 1100 £. stock, to Mr. *Wright*. A *Jesuit*, besides, as such, he knew, might be ordered to some distant part of the earth, at a moment's warning; and, at the longest, *Shireburn*, it was likely, would return to his college abroad, whenever the term of his provincialship should expire. And no successor could be answerable for a debt of *Shireburn's*, in a legal way. — If Mr. *Bower*, therefore, meant not to throw himself upon the mercy of his order, in this affair, would he have ever consented to part with his money upon such slippery terms? — The *Jesuits* moreover, he tells us, *will stick at nothing when the advantage of their order is at stake* (1). As, therefore, it would have been

(1) Pag. 78. Mr. *Bower* is desperately entangled p. 77, and 78. between a good and an ill character of the *Jesuits*. He tells us, that they are, *generally speaking, men of liberal minds, most of them gentlemen born, have not only a learned but a polite education, most agreeable companions, that they are not even men of bad principles.* And yet these very men *will stick at nothing when the advantage of their order is at stake.* The last representation, is because they have discovered so much concerning him, and the first not to provoke them to discover more. And, upon the whole, I cannot but think that the *Jesuits* are extremely obliged to him: for whereas, till now that body had always been looked upon by Protestants as the most dangerous of all the orders in the Romish church, Mr. *Bower* sets us right by giving them the preference to the monks, friars and secular clergy, who, he says, *are a very different race of men from the Jesuits*, p. 78. — I shall only observe upon this, that his representation of the Popish se-

been greatly for the advantage of their order, to have sent *Shireburn* out of the way, in which case *Bower's* annuity might have been stopt by them, with impunity, how could he have ventured to put himself in the power of men thus disposed, if he had considered this as a mere money bargain, in which there was no friendship or confidence expressed on either side? — But, perhaps, *Mr. Bower*, tho' a good Protestant, was willing to run some risk, and to deal with the *Jesuits* under all the above disadvantages, from the temptation of *better interest for his money than any body else was willing to allow him*: this, indeed, he owns to be the case, in p. 110; but, unluckily, he had forgot what he had said in p. 102, that *Father Hill* offered him the same interest, *that was given by the trustees of St. Botolph's church* (1). One of these representations must be false. If the latter was the true one, then, by his own confession, he was not tempted by a better interest, to accept of an insufficient security: and that the former is false, must be obvious to every one conversant in the price of annuities. In the year 1741, *Mr. Bower*, then 55 years of age, might have had, at least 7 per cent for his life, on as solid security, as *England* could afford, without being obliged to trust to the honor of his friends the *Jesuits*.

cular clergy in *England*, is contrary to what the government ever found them from *Elizabeth* to this time. In many reigns they were protected by the ministers of state against the *Jesuits*; who, I am afraid, must get some other advocate, besides *father Bower*, before Protestants change an opinion which hath hitherto been uncontroverted.

(1) Upon looking into the act of parliament, for rebuilding *St. Botolph's church*, I find that the trustees were enabled to raise their money — six thousand pounds, by granting annuities, not exceeding eight and a half per cent.

He

He is pleased to mention, by way of illustration of the innocence of his intentions, in this affair, *that if a Jew had offered him better interest, he would have preferred the Jew to the Jesuit*, p. 104. What? would he have bought an annuity of a Jew, who had no property of his own, or accepted of the personal bond of an itinerant broker, who might decamp next day, and leave no effects, or representatives behind him? Mr. Bower must excuse me for thinking, that no temptation of getting better interest could have induced him to trust his money in such hands. And, yet, it appears, that he bought his annuity of a *Jesuit* whose circumstances are exactly parallel as to inability to give security, and with whom Mr. Bower had peculiar reasons to avoid all acquaintance, much less to trust him with all his fortune, even tho' he had run no risk by so doing. Nor was he surprized into this false step by any *inadvertency or hurry*. His country (1) neighbour who made this apology for him, had forgot what Mr. Bower himself is now obliged to own, that above two years elapsed, between the beginning and the conclusion of the bargain. Upon the whole, then, of this affair, turn it into whatever shape you please, it can never have the appearance of a money bargain, entered into by two persons unconnected with each other; and Mr. Bower's conduct in it can receive no other solution, but the true one, that he meant to give his order a convincing proof that he was willing to be received into favor, and put his money into their hands as an earnest of his sincerity.

But he thinks, he has hit upon a circumstance which will remove all suspicions, telling us; *that his requiring a bond for the payment of an annuity during his life, which bond he knew would be null the moment he was reconciled to his order, is a convincing proof that at the time he demanded it, he had no intention of*

(1) See a pamphlet, called *Bower Vindicated* &c.

being reconciled to the order, as long as he lived (1).—
 Left any one should be imposed upon by this shuffling
 quibble, I shall now produce an effectual answer to
 it, from a quarter little expected. For tho' the *Jesuits*
 in England have done all they could to (2) stifle the in-
 quiry

(1) Page 111.

(2) The reluctance of those persons in whose hands the
 authentic vouchers of the money transaction were lodged to
 give them up, was extremely remarkable. Sir *Henry Bi-
 dingfeld*, himself, tho' he had been in possession of the letters
 to *Sheldon*, some years, had not been able to learn the real
 state of it; and it was not till after he had been represented,
 by the blind zeal of Mr. *Bower's* friends, as the instrument
 of handing a forgery into the world, that the *Jesuits*, in
 compliance with his pressing solicitations, did give him some
 light into the affair. But tho' they have been prevailed up-
 on to discover something, to extricate a principal gentleman
 of their communion out of a disagreeable dilemma into which
 the amazing extent of the prejudice and credulity of a few,
 had let him, they have been obstinate in refusing their as-
 sistance, farther than they have judged necessary for the
 clearing up the single point of *Bower's* correspondence with
Sheldon, and have withheld from Sir *Henry*, fresh and more
 striking evidences which they are known to have, of this
 man's connexions with them. Father *Carteret* often men-
 tioned to his acquaintance, that he had twelve or more letters
 written to him by *Bower*, containing matter still more deci-
 sive as to the writer's real character, than we read in those
 to *Sheldon*. These letters he said were at his convent in
London, but that he would not give them up, unless Mr.
Bower attacked him personally, as he did not think it right to
 publish a private correspondence. This reason having, no
 longer, any existence, after *Carteret's* death, in March last,
 Sir *Henry Bidingfeld* made instant application, to have so
 curious a correspondence delivered up to him; but after
 several months negotiation about it, the delivery of those
 letters is at great a distance as ever. So that Mr. *Bower*
 however he may affect to look upon the letters to *Sheldon*,
 as a forgery contrived by the *Jesuits* to ruin him, has reason
 to know, that the *Jesuits* are his best friends. This, than, being
 the

quiry into Mr. Bower's character and connexions with them, I have it now in my power to make them speak out, as to this point; and to give such evidence, as must satisfy the public, that a *Jesuit* may, consistently with the rules of his order, have a settlement made upon him for life; and that as the slaves of ancient Rome had their *peculium* exempt from the power of their masters, so also the slaves of modern Rome, are allowed, notwithstanding their vows of poverty, to have their *peculium*, independent of the public purse of the community.

Father Sheldon's letters and papers were seized in Nov. 1745, by an order from the Secretary of State; luckily for Mr. Bower, before his correspondence began. These letters were put into the hands of his Majesty's Law Clerk, to make an abstract of their contents. A copy of this abstract I have procured; and this piece of evidence will deserve some respect from Mr. Bower, not only as I have it from a Protestant quarter, but as the original exists in a public office. From these papers then I shall select the following instances, to prove that the *Jesuits* have settlements amongst themselves.

Liverpool, Nov. 4, 1744. April 21, 1745, and Sept. 7, 1745. C. Murphy to Sheldon excuses himself from being his Socius, being settled in a family where he was chaplain, and executor to his patron's private intentions; and that his patroness had left a thousand pounds to Mr. Lancaster (a cant name for Hill) the interest whereof was to be laid out in maintaining him.

the case, it is with some satisfaction, that I have been able to make some of these persons, turn evidence against their unfortunate brother; and, in particular, one of their body who, if I am rightly informed, has openly declared himself the protector of father Bower, and has screened him from the inquiries of Protestants, by directing the refusal of his letters to Carteret,

Blandyke,

Blandyke (1), April 3, 1745. J. Howard writes
 from this college to Sheldon, and tells him, that he
 and his brother have an estate, at *Ecton* in
Leicestershire, near *Preston*, under the care of Mr.
Lawson, which they are willing to give towards
 founding a place at Blandyke, provided they have a
 certain sum allowed for their lives.
Wolton, near *Chipping Norton*, April 3, 1745.
 Thom. Conyers to Sheldon. Mr. Hill, your receiver,
 has upwards of 600 £. of mine, in his hands. It
 was paid into his office, Jan. 1743-44, for which
 Mr. Shirburn made me no settlement: he said he
 would give me 8 or 9 per cent; but if you will give
 me 5, to be paid quarterly, I shall be satisfied.
 I shall make no reflexion on these instances; but
 what must occur to every reader, that, from the evi-
 dence of *Jesuits* thus forced to speak out, it appears
 to be no unusual thing, for a *Jesuit* when he becomes
 possessed of any property, to be allowed during his
 own life time to enjoy the interest of it, and to treat
 with his superiors, to have an annuity or settlement
 made, in consideration of it. And if this be ac-
 tually done be *Jesuits* in full peace with the body, was
 it extraordinary that father *Bower*, returning like a pro-
 digal son, and before he was sure of forgiveness, should
 regulate in the like manner? The instances just a-
 signed are so home to the point, that the plea most con-
 fidently urged by Mr. *Bower* about the bond, will serve
 only to convince every one that his great aim is to mi-
 seduce by groundless sophistry, and that he will venture
 to assert any thing when he thinks we have no means
 in our power, of confuting him. And he would have
 escaped confutation as to this remarkable part of his
 (1) I have been informed that *Blandyke* is a place
 in *Leicestershire*, near *Preston*, under the care of Mr.
Lawson, which they are willing to give towards
 founding a place at Blandyke, provided they have a
 certain sum allowed for their lives.

defence, if, by a most fortunate concurrence of circumstances, his friends the *Jesuits* had not been brought, unknown to themselves, to turn evidences against him. --- I shall only add, that in the whole course of *Sheldon's* correspondence (which is a pretty large one) I do not find any one Protestant lending his money to the *Jesuits*. Protestants have no objection to such dealings with *Jews* giving good security, but are too wise to accept of a personal bond, from a provincial of the *Jesuits*.

But the asking of this bond, is not the only proof urged by *Bower* of his having no intention to return to his order. For he insists much upon this argument. — 'That a *Jesuit* who has taken the last vows cannot be turned out of the order, and that when he apostatizes the order is bound to receive him again, whenever he offers to return, that the *Jesuits* by their own account, did not receive him at the time of the money transaction; therefore, he did not at the time of that transaction, offer to return (1).

Mr. *Bower*, upon this occasion, triumphs greatly over my ignorance, as to the constitutions of the venerable body to which he belonged; a most disgraceful circumstance this for a Protestant and an admirable proof that *I have written in concert with the Jesuits*, as he would have the public believe! But if my ignorance, in this matter, be culpable, Mr. *Bower's* chicane is much more so. For tho' he so peremptorily asserts, over and over again, that he could not be expelled the order, having taken the last vows, his last words in p. 109. seem to unfold all this quibbling prevarication. The society can expell those who have not made their last vows, without the Pope, but the Pope must confirm the expulsion of those who have made them. The *Jesuits* were erected for the particular support of the prerogatives of the see of *Rome*, and the person of the Pope; on which account, tho'

they have a general, yet the Pope is properly head of the order. Hence the reason that he who has made the last vows, and now become his *Janisary* compleat, cannot be expelled without his allowance. *Bower* takes advantage of this plain, simple fact, to say with his usual regard to truth that a *Jesuit*, after the last vows cannot be expelled.

Equally remote from truth is what he is pleased to say about their being obliged to receive an apostate whenever he *offers* to return. If instead of saying whenever he *offers to return*, he had said, whenever *he returns*, this I suppose is the real state of the case. But this would not serve his purpose: because it would immediately occur as an answer, that Mr. *Bower* could not be said to *return* to the body he had left, if he did not go abroad and absolutely submit himself to the mercy of his general, without any previous negociation. Had Mr. *Bower* returned, in this sense, to his order, they must indeed have received him: but how? perhaps, confined him within four walls, or banished him to convert the *Iroquois*. The prudent apostate, knew this, and avoided any such inconvenience by stipulating for *terms* and *conditions* before hand, which his superiors certainly had it in their power to refuse, and which it was likely they would take time to consider of. They could not be very forward to receive again into their *body* one whose former conduct had disgraced it; and it was natural for them to desire more certain proofs of his Reformation, than the mere offer of his money could give them, before they consented to employ as a missionary in the *English* province, one who had deserted to *England*, and had lived there many years in disobedience. In this situation, the negociation about his being *readmitted* (or reconciled, or received again, for I pretend not to be so skilful a quibbler as he is) could not but be drawn out into length, and consequently he might *offer* to
return

return in 1741, when he gave his money, and those offers not be accepted of till 1745, when he was received by father *Carteret*. — What he observes about the *Jesuits* courting *Jarrige*, another apostate, to return, will not prove as he urges, the improbability of their being so reluctant to receive himself. The two cases were very unsimilar. He might have learnt from *Boyle*, that *Jarrige* left the order in discontent, and was not obliged to elope for soliciting his penitent. *Jarrige* turned Protestant because his merit was not rewarded, *Bower* had deserted into *England* lest his crimes should be punished. *Jarrige*, by employing all his abilities as a writer, in making an attack upon the body he had left, was an acquisition which it was for their honor and interest of this body to make. *Bower*, at that time, was not an object of their attention, by his obscurity, and by his general character, was an acquisition likely to renew that disgrace which he had, before, brought upon them. — Upon this comparison, therefore, every body must see a strong reason for the *Jesuits* being zealous, to prevail upon *Jarrige* to go back to *France*, and for their hesitation and delay in complying with the applications of *Bower*, to employ him as a missionary in *England*.

What hath been offered about the money transaction, and to dispell those mists of *Jesuitical* chicanery, in which Mr. *Bower* hath endeavored to wrap it up, will, I believe, to every reader of discernment, be decisive of this man's character, even tho' no farther proofs of his secret dealings with the *Jesuits* had ever come to light. But when we consider this transaction as connected with the letters to father *Sheldon*, can any one avoid drawing this plain consequence, that he who, by his own confession, was so indiscrete as to lend his money to one provincial, may well be supposed to have been so indiscrete as to write submissive letters

to the successor of this provincial, with a view to get it out of their hands? (1)

The money transaction with the *Jesuits*, appearing so unfavorable to the supposition of Mr. *Bower's* innocence, I shall beg leave now to swell the catalogue of his contradictions, prevarications, and impostures, by pointing out a few, but very striking instances, to prove that he is a man capable of asserting any thing, however false, absurd, or contradictory; and consequently, that we ought to decide against him merely upon hearing his defence, and even without taking into our consideration the weight of evidence which supports the accusation.

Willing to give us a convincing proof of his religious observance of his vow of *chastity*, long after he had broken through the rest, he tells us (2), *That he was 20 years in ENGLAND before he thought of a bedfellow, and 24 before he had one.* With regard to a fact of this kind, surely no body can suppose that Mr. *Bower's* memory should fail him. --- What opinion, therefore, can we have of this man's veracity, who, in his *answer to a new charge* admits the truth of a courtship, which must have had its commencement many years before the period which he mentions? --- But, besides this courtship, which he hath admitted, what will he say to another courtship, which he dares not deny? In my former pamphlet, I hinted, in a note, (3) at a story, the remembrance of which cannot sit easy on his mind, if breach of the most solemn enga-

(1) Tho' after what hath been said, there can be no doubt that Mr. *Bower's* money transaction was with the body of the *Jesuits*, I shall add, as a corroboration of this, that Mr. *Maire* an eminent council of *Gray-Inn*, remembers that father *Hill* had a conversation with him, in which he mentioned that *Bower* had an annuity from the body, and that he pressed to have his money again.

(2) P. 33. First Part.

(3) Pag. 82.

gements

geme
ask h
he be
which
little
nothi
prove
hund
in th
passio
Bath
we kn
Bu
perha
Mr. A
with
writi

(1)
migh
Bowe
the li
obser
peate
cumf
wick
the c
tho' l
mone
the fi
offere
festin
may
contr
1750
impo
ciatio
This
this p

gements can give uneasiness. And here I shall only ask him, had he been in *England* twenty years, when he began his courtship of Mrs. *A---d*, a courtship in which he persevered (the event shewed, with how little sincerity) for at least fifteen years? --- I assert nothing, but what I have undoubted evidence to prove; and if the Lady, to whom he paid the five hundred pounds, could not be the person alluded to, in the letters to *Sheldon*, if he borrowed his compassionate plea from a real occurrence, the Lady at *Barb*, who died of a broken heart, *might*, for aught we know, furnish him with the ground-work of it (1).

But, however authenticated this courtship may be, perhaps his candid friends will pay no regard to it, if Mr. *Bower* should deny it with the same steadiness with which he hath given the lie to his own handwriting. In order then to satisfy the scruples of such

(1) That the woman and the child, in the *Six Letters*, might have no existence, but in the inventive brain of Mr. *Bower*, endeavoring to raise the compassion of *Sheldon*, as the likeliest way of inducing him to return the money, I observed in my first pamphlet; and, in my second, I repeated it as my opinion that a woman to whom all the circumstances mentioned, did belong, never existed but in the wicked heart of the author of the letters. — This then being the case, it can serve Mr. *Bower's* purpose very little, even tho' he should be able to prove that his solicitude to get his money from *Sheldon* did not arise, from his being pressed for the five hundred pounds. What I offered on that head was offered only as a *conjecture*, which may be false without affecting the genuineness of the letters to *Sheldon*, but which may be true for any thing that Mr. *Bower* hath said to the contrary. For tho' this money was not paid by him till 1750, we are still at a loss to know, when he began to be importuned to fulfill his promise of marriage; which negotiation may have been depending three or four years before. — This note is a compleat answer to Mr. *Bower's* triumphs on this point, in his answer to a new charge.

last friends, I must cast about for other evidence, adapted to their capacities, and unexceptionable in their judgments-- the consistent affirmation of Mr. *Bower*, himself who in his *second part* (which hath come to my hands, since I sat down to write this confutation, and which like the victories of *Pyrrhus* will hasten his ruin) owns without reserve, his secret assignations with Mrs. *Mary Sutton*, which had been mentioned by Mrs. *Hoyles*. Had Mr. *Bower* no thoughts of a bedfellow, while he was thus employed? And this, by his own confession, was not even *one* year, much less twenty, after his arrival in *England*.— There is something so decisive as to this man's *real* character in his manner of relating this intrigue with Mrs. *Sutton*, that I must beg the reader to indulge me in making a few reflexions upon it.

He tells us then (1), that he was *well acquainted* with Mrs. *Sutton*, that he had frequent meetings with her at Mrs. *Hoyles's* room, but that he *never met her alone, after her marriage*. To find a priest of the church of *Rome*, and a professed *Jesuit*, turned of forty, owning to us almost in so many words, as he minces the matter, that he kept company with a *courtesan*; having *secret* meetings with a woman, who as a Papist, and servant at the house where he visited his superior, and was known to be a priest, could have no thoughts of being his *wife*, to find such a confession made to us, without shame, may, indeed, do Mr. *Bower* no harm in the opinion of a few who are so candid as to overlook his *indiscretions*, but will strike the heart of every one unpolluted by habits of sensuality, with detestation; will greatly help the reader to form a judgment as to the probability of his having had the same *amorous* inclinations in *Italy*; and, in particular, will add to the credibility of the intrigue, he is said to have had, with the nun.

(1) Pag. 27. First Part.

But

But can we wonder at any thing of this kind in Mr. Bower's conduct, when we find him telling us, in the same place, that he never *set up for a saint*; and asking us when did I assume *the mask of sanctify*? If *saint* signifies a *holy* and *virtuous* person (which is the qualified and rational sense of the word) he professed himself such, when he was ordained a priest of his church, whose office it is to administer the sacraments, hear confessions, enjoin penance, and give absolution. But, it seems evident by his present style, that he than only wore the mask of *sanctity*. He boasts of his *moral honesty*, and says *he never pretended to any other praise than that of an honest man* (1). It appears, then, that he never pretended to the praise of a *religious* man. This was a character below the ambition of our convert. He aimed only to be thought *morally honest*. And so says the *Deist* when he is taxed with having debauched his neighbour's daughter. — What were the ingredients of the *moral honesty*, from which Mr. Bower is *sure he never departed*, we are not told; but, from his own words, it is evident, that *the strict purity and sanctity enjoined by the Gospel*, from which he admits *he has departed*, make no part of it. Now I always understood that the Gospel enjoined nothing in the practice of *common life*, but what *moral honesty* required, and particularly that fornication or vague lust was against *moral honesty*; the Gospel giving the practice of *fornication*, as one of the marks of a *reprobate mind*, even in a Pagan, because he knew by natural light, that such a crime was against *moral honesty* (2). Is this, then, all the sanctity that the church of Rome requires in her priests? And may we not reasonably expect something more from one, who still professes himself a friend (3), to the *spiritual exercises*, used by the *Jesuits*, as conducive to holiness? — *Honourable names among the dead as well*

(1) P. 28. 2d. Part. (2) R. c. 1. v. 28. (3) P. 28. 2d. Part.

as living, who have extended their protection and patronage to this man, saw him, without doubt, in a very different light, from that in which he is now forced to place himself. And as to those of his friends who *knew* what practices he included in his notions of *moral bonesty*, and still supported him, I shall leave the readers to judge whether their *morality* can be supposed to be of a different school. --- The boasts of this man, that he never endeavored to cloke his *frailties* and *follies* (for what would be vice in others, doth not merit a name so harsh in Mr. Bower) under the mask of *sanctity*, point out a striking resemblance between his character, and that drawn by Dr. Arbuthnot, whose hero was totally exempt from the vice of *hypocrisy*, by his *matchless impudence*.

The remarkable intrigue with Mrs. Sutton, one of Mr. Bower's first exploits after his coming to England, as it will serve to give us a general view of the character of the man, so will it most remarkably confute what he himself had asserted, *that he had been twenty years in England before he thought of a bedfellow* (1), and satisfy us that whatever merit his *answers* may have, they want one necessary qualification to make them satisfactory --- that of presenting us with the truth.

I beg leave upon this head, only to observe farther, that Mr. Bower's doctrine, in matters of gallantry, is highly worthy of remark. For till *his* time we never

(1) Since I wrote the above paragraph, I have seen Mr. Bower's remarks on the *Critical Review*, in which he impudently avows, that *he never pretended to the praise of having preserved an inviolable chastity*, and is very angry with the reviewers for supposing he could ever mean to say this. Mrs. Sutton, therefore, poor woman, was only to be an *occasional bedfellow*. But what will Mr. Bower say to the two other gentlewomen, whom he certainly courted, to be *bedfellows* in his own sense, long before the twenty years he mentions, had elapsed?

heard,

heard, that it is no reflection upon a man's general character, to have liked a woman enough to make her hope he would marry her, and yet disappoint her in those expectations, no promise of marriage having been given.

(1) And he who could assert this so boldly to the public, will not blush to assert, that it is no reflection upon his general character, to have given hopes of marriage to three women; (2) at least at the same time, and to have married a fourth at last. --- But I leave this part of the controversy to be decided by Mr. Bower's female acquaintance who are the best judges of what moral honesty dictates in such matters, and shall proceed now to other instances of his wonderful veracity.

I had asserted, in my first pamphlet, that *Martin Folkes Esq;* had expressed his suspicions of our historian's character, and subscribed to his history only because it was fashionable to do so. Now observe Mr. Bower's answer, 'Mr. Folkes invited me to his house to see the wondrous operations of the polype, and shewing me on that occasion his collection of books, he very politely offered to supply me with any he was possessed of, and I might want for my

(1) Answer to a new charge, p. 8. I leave it to Mr. Bower, to employ all his chicane to reconcile his assertion that there was no promise of marriage made by him, with his confession that he paid this gentlewoman 500 pounds. But I am desired by Sir Henry Bedingsfeld to say upon his authority, that *the promise was of ten years standing, and that besides the 500 pounds, Mr. Bower pays this gentlewoman now (and very regularly) an annuity during his life.*

(2) The gentlewoman to whom he paid the 500 £; Mrs. A---ld of Bath, who died, soon after she heard of his marriage; and Mrs. Hamilton, for so, as I have been informed, the Lady was called, with whom, he tells us, more than once, he was engaged in a treaty of marriage, in 1746, and about the time of his corresponding with Sheldon, by which confession he himself points out a cause for his solicitude to recover his money.

'work.

work. One might, I think, conclude from this circumstance that he entertained no suspicions of my character, and that he did not subscribe to my history merely because it was fashionable to do so. (1) --- If this be true Mr. Bower has indeed given a compleat answer. But, unfortunately, even where he thought himself safe from contradiction, in asserting a transaction with a deceased gentleman, he hath mentioned circumstances which enable us to detect him. Mr. Folkes shewed the *Polype* only in March 1742-43. This I assert on the authority of several learned members of that society of which Mr. Folkes was president, who remember the fact, and that Mr. Folkes, tired with entertaining his friends with this shew, never troubled himself farther about it, after he read his paper on that subject, before the *Royal Society* on the 24 of that month (2). --- If, therefore, Mr. Bower ever was invited to see the polype at Mr. Folkes's house, this must have happened near (3) four years, before his intentions of writing his history of the Popes were known, and consequently four years, before Mr. Folkes could make such an offer of the use of his books, for Mr. Bower's work. --- But tho' we had not been able to convict our worthy historian, by the stubborn authority of dates, the fact that Mr. Folkes had received an ill impression of him from seeing him frequently with the Popish priests at *Lewis's* shop, can be ascertained by the testimony of several intimate friends of the president, persons who are known to Mr. Bower's patrons, and whom they

(1) First defence, p. 95.

(2) This paper is published in the philosophical transactions, V. 42. N°. 469, p. 422.

(3) Mr. Bower in the second part of his answer, p. 20 fixes the date of his declaring his having resolved to engage in the history of the Popes, no farther back than 1746.

have opportunities of seeing frequently. And, in order to satisfy them, how credible a witness Mr. A. B. is, the same gentlemen will inform them, of what every body who knew Mr. Folkes, must know to be true, that far from offering to lend books, he never lent them when asked; but replied to applications of this sort when made to him, by using the words — *I neither borrow nor lend* (1).

When Mr. Bower cannot deny a fact, his next aim is to deceive his readers by an impudent misrepresentation of it. Thus in answer to my charge of profane raillery on seeing a picture at a gentleman's house in the country, he has the amazing assurance to call it a *Popish Picture* (2). Let the reader now judge of this man's religion and veracity. It was a picture of Jesus preaching in the temple which gave Mr. Bower the very seasonable occasion of displaying his wit. This then we see him call a *Popish Picture*, i. e. a picture of a story invented by the Pope and his emissaries. I believe it might be so for aught he knew. Tradition, and the written word, had been jumbled together in his education. He was then in search of truth, and was, as yet, in his elements. Besides, he tells us (3), that he was jealous of a second imposition. Every thing smelt of Popery, and he was a Christian at large only, rambling about in the borders of Protestantism. He, therefore, who had

(1) Tho' I cannot disprove what Mr. Bower says of the conversation which passed between him and the Rev. Mr. Hill, so authentically as I have disproved what he asserts about Mr. Folkes, his patrons may satisfy themselves, by inquiries which they know where to make, that Mr. Hill's representation of that conversation was very unfavorable to Mr. Bower's character, which, ever since, has been in very little estimation, in the family of the great prelate, with whom Mr. Hill was then connected.

(2) 96.

(3) Do. 96. (1)

H

nevre

never before seen a Protestant picture (for he had never yet been in a Protestant church) might well mistake this for a Popish one. — But this was not the mistake objected to him. His reflexions upon it, and on the principal figure of the piece, were neither Popish nor Protestant, but merely Pagan. — Tho' after all, I think it hard upon any man, but hardest of all upon Mr. *Bower*, to be called to the remembrance of what he spoke, I will not say 20 years ago, but what he spoke last year, last month, or even last week.

That this strange man cares not what he asserts, however contradictory it may be to his former uniform declarations, if thereby he may serve a present turn, will appear from another instance, (1) where he tells us, *that a considerable part of the Roman history*, in the *Universal history*, was not his, but written by one whom he had employed. — The merit of the whole *Roman history*, in that work, having hitherto been attributed by the world in general, to Mr. *Bower*, his disavowal of a considerable part of it surprized me, as it did those who had access to know the real state of that matter; and the following letter, the original of which I have in my hands, from a fellow labourer in the *Universal history*, will shew how little we can depend on any thing this man thinks it convenient to say.

Monday, Jan. 10. 1757.

S I R, In answer to the favour of yours, I can only say, that Mr. *Bower* always acknowledged to me the writing of the *whole Roman history himself*, and what is more, has owned the charge I often laid against him of lengthening it beyond due bounds, to the

(1) Pag. 40. First Part.

detri-

detriment of the *Byzantine* part, which is most badly curtailed by it, tho' it deserved to have been more fully handled, as the most curious, interesting, and least known; and I never heard him say, that he had turned over to any hand. But whether so or no, as I never saw any of his copy, the compositor and corrector are the only persons that can tell you, whether it was his own writing, or only revised by him. I am sorry you should have so many after claps from him after having been so ill treated by him, as we also have been, by the airs he gave himself at *Oxford* about the (1) second edition of the work. Care has been taken to expose his vanity there, and I doubt not, but he will meet with the same justice in every thing else. I am,

Sir, Yours, &c.

Besides the above testimony of one so well acquainted with Mr. *Bower*, I shall add, that the proprietors of the history have now heard, for the first time, that any part of the *Roman* history was not Mr. *Bower's*, who was paid for it as his own; that the compositor of the press says, that *to the best of his knowledge, all the copy was BOWER's handwriting*; and the very worthy person, at whose press it was

(1) Mr. *Bower* received 300 pounds, for revising and altering the *Universal* history, when printed a second time. He boasted at *Oxford*, that he had corrected vast many blunders of his fellow — labourers. How truly the reader will observe from my former pamphlet, where I mentioned, that upon collating the two editions, so far as Mr. *Salé* wrote, it appeared that he had not made a single alteration, only substituted, in a few places the *Hebrew* Chronology in the room of the *Samaritan* (not *Septuagint*, as was mentioned by mistake.) — In short, the booksellers found out, at last, that Mr. *Bower* had been paid 300 £. for doing next to nothing.

printed, if I may depend on those who have asked him, believes this was the case. — But a disavowal of a considerable part of the *Roman history*, was now thought necessary. The plagiarism of its author had been much talked of, of late; Mr. Bower, therefore, willing to do justice to his character, not only as a man, but as a writer, endeavors to throw this disgraceful charge upon some nameless unknown person whom he says he employed. Perhaps, he would have consulted his own honor better, had he thought of the same excuse for his history of the Popes, and apologized for his shameless translations from *Tillemont* by imputing them to the same able and conscientious friend, who could present the public with a *Roman history*, pilfered from *Bundy* and *Hooke* (1).

But this dauntless man thinks himself at full liberty not only to falsify facts, but also to misrepresent opinions. — A most wonderful instance of this, occurs in his first defence. There he has the boldness to assert, 'That a man may deny the Pope's supremacy, and nevertheless be a good Catholic —

(1) As amazing an instance as any, of Mr. Bower's impositions upon the public may be read, p. 14. of his answer to a new charge. There we find a certificate, signed *William Sandby* in which it is said that the author of *Bower* and *Tillemont* compared is mistaken in his conjecture, p. 65, that paper not being handed to the press by Mr. Bower, but given to Mr. Sandby by a customer, to be inserted in the general evening post. — What will the reader say when he hears, that the same Mr. Sandby, since the publication of the above certificate, has frankly owned to some of his acquaintance, that he received the paper referred to, from an intimate friend of Bower, and that the money which he paid for the insertion of it, was put to Mr. Bower's account, and that he was allowed for this money, by Mr. Bower, when he settled accounts with him, in December last? Mr. Sandby's character as an honest worthy man, shews that his name hath been wantonly made use of, by his conscientious author, on this occasion.

that

‘ that this supremacy is no article of Catholic communion — that the *Jansenists* of France deny it--- and
 ‘ that this tenet may be disclaimed by a Papist, as the
 ‘ Pope’s being Antichrist may by a Protestant.’ (1)---
 Is not this a prodigy of front or brain? Does he
 presume we have lost our understanding, or has he
 himself never had any in these matters, and so cannot
 distinguish between the Popes *supremacy* and his *in-*
fallibility? It is the latter which is no article of
 Catholic communion, which the *Jansenists* bring into
 question, (2)--- and which a Papist even as such may
 deny. Had he ever looked into a Protestant book,
 called *Barrow* on the supremacy of the Pope, he
 would have known that this doctrine, far from being
 no article of Catholic communion, is the very corner
 stone of the religion, the article most fundamental of
 all others in Popery and on which, according to *Bellar-*
mine, the very sum and substance of Christianity
 depends (3). --- He is pleased to exult much over
 my ignorance relating to the constitutions and prac-
 tices of the *Jesuits*, and to say that I shall be laughed

(1) Pag. 73-74.

(2) Mr. *Bower*’s ignorance of the question of *Jansenism*,
 which has so long distracted the Gallican church, is deplorable. He thinks it to be a dispute about *discipline*, in which
 indeed the *supremacy* is concerned; whereas it is about *doctrine* which concerns the *infallibility*. Now the *Jansenists*
 and almost every body else but the *Jesuits* deny the personal
 infallibility. The two seconds, indeed, in the quarrel, namely
 the French king, and the parliament of *Paris*, dispute about
discipline, or the conduct of confessors to their penitents.
 But the dispute between the principals, namely the pope and
 the French *Jansenists* is about doctrine, or whether the propo-
 sitions which the bull *Unigenitus* condemns, are heret-
 ical.

(3) *Agitur de Summa rei Christiana*. Are *Bellarminis*
 words speaking of the supremacy; as I find quoted by *Barrow*,
 in his Introduction.

at for it, by the monks and priests of the church of Rome. Perhaps I may, and I care not. But does he himself hope to escape ridicule and contempt; from the whole body of the *English* clergy, and every sensible Protestant, *he* who has assumed the character of historian of the *Roman Catholic* church, and, as *Milton* says of *Salmasius*, has *threatened to sink the Pope to death*, and yet knows so little of Popery, or misrepresents so impudently what he knows, as to confound the supremacy of the Pope, which is an essential of the church of Rome, with his infallibility, which is only an essential of the court of Rome? -- He has the effrontery to add (1); *I have found even in our greatest divines some slips of this nature*; viz. of misrepresentation of Popery.

But, however capable Mr. *Bower* appears to be of defending himself by falsification of facts, contradictions, prevarication, and every art of shuffling misrepresentation, I own I did not expect to find him so much off his guard, as to inform us, that *all this*, and more also, he can do upon principle. -- He tells us, (2). *That he abjured in his mind the Pope's supremacy, while he lived at Rome, and before he made his last vows.* These last vows, he tells us, in the same page, were made by him in *March 1722*, at *Florence*, and it was after this that he was appointed professor in the university of *Macerata*. Now, if I am informed right, it is a part of the last vows of a *Jesuit*, to bind himself to a slavish and entire obedience to the *Pope*. And all who teach in universities, Divinity, Philosophy, Grammar, or other liberal arts, (3) subscribe, under oath, the confession of faith, or *Pope Pius's* creed, in which the *Pope's* supremacy

(1) Pag. 77.

(2) Pag. 73. First Part.

(3) By a bull of *Pius IV.* published in 1564. See the *Bullar.* T. II. p. 124.

is taught in the strongest terms; and renew this subscription, yearly, in a solemn public manner (1). --- What opinion, therefore, can any honest man have of a person who thus, without reserve, and without seeming to know he says any thing derogatory to his character, owns, that both by his last vows, and by his accepting of the office of professor (and the same must be said of his office of *Consultor*) he hath made frequent and solemn appeals to heaven of his believing the supremacy of the Pope, which doctrine he tells us expressly he had *before abjured in his mind*? --- If Mr. *Bower's* conduct was influenced by such diabolical principles while he was in *Italy*, what assurance can he give us that he has forgot them, now that he is in *England*? --- The convenient doctrine of mental abjuration, thus avowed by him will solve all the seeming absurdities, inconsistencies, and prevarications, which we have charged against him: we shall no longer wonder to find him making experiments on the extent of Protestant credulity, by assuming a character which never belonged to him, and by relating adventures which never happened; we shall no longer be at a loss to account for his breach of the most solemn engagements to deceived females; we need not be surprized at his impudent attempt to impose upon us a patched up translation of a modern *French* book, for an original history of the popes; we may well suppose him capable of those deliberate and frequent departures from truth, which we have proved upon him; we may now account for his making Proselytes to Popery, while he passed for a sincere convert from that religion; we may suppose him capable of appearing

(1) How rigorously this is observed may be seen from Buonacini in Decal. T. II. p. 118.

a Papist to some, a Protestant to others, while, he had *abjured* in his mind, the principles of Christianity. In a word, one who is pleased to adopt the detestable doctrine of *mental abjuration*, acts conformably to his principles, or rather to his want of principles, when he says any thing, or swears any thing, however wide from the truth; and can even go greater lengths, if greater be possible, than to make solemn appeals to heaven, in order to destroy the authenticity of letters written by himself, and proved to be so by every internal mark of genuineness, and by a wonderful chain of collateral evidence (1).

And

(1) Besides owning that he had abjured in his mind, what he *must* afterwards have sworn he believed, it seems to me that there needs no other argument to evince that his affidavit deserves no credit, but to read the history he gives of himself, in his first answer. For he was 21 years a *Jesuit* i. e. (according to him) a man who would have done *any wickedness; stick at nothing*, to serve the interest of the society to which he belonged. Who can question but such a man will *do any wickedness for his private interest*, particularly that he will *sacrifice himself, if a false path be necessary* to preserve him from total ruin? Again; during the three last of those 21 years, he was an *Assessor*, a *Counsellor*, an *Adviser*, of what he calls an *infernal*, a *hellish tribunal*; and, by his own account of himself, he was the *most infernal hellish* person of all that belonged to that tribunal. For he represents the rest as in the delusion (which our Savior mentions) of *thinking they did God good service*, by tormenting persons they called heretics, and as grown *insensible and callous* (if they ever had any softness); but he represents himself as *acting daily cruelties for three years together*, and, at length, joining in the *murder of his intimate friend by tortures of three days continuance*; I say he represents himself as doing these wicked deeds in spite both of *conscience*, and the feelings of *humanity* i. e. in defiance both of *nature* and *grace*. So odious a monster, as he makes himself to be, I think I never read of. But he is so wretched a *casuist* that he seems to think that he was *less criminal*, than the other members of the inquisition, if he acted against his *light* and his *natural*
good

And now, having followed Mr. *Bower* through all his turnings, back again into the field of action, where he ought to defend himself, and from which he had withdrawn, I shall renew my attack, where I first began, and bring back the controversy, to the capital point to be decided. --- *Whether the Six Letters produced were really written by him, or forged, as he pretends, by the Jesuits?* Satisfied as I am that our artful convert, tho' he were to employ all the casuistry of a *Suarez* or an *Escobar*, can never impose upon any reader of discernment, and persuade him to look upon a genuine correspondence to be a *plain and palpable forgery*, I might, without leaving him in possession of any marks of victory, have rested the merits of the debate, upon the arguments which I produced at first. But as the effrontery of my antagonist is as extraordinary as his guilt is heinous; and as there are, no doubt, many readers who have just capacity enough to see when an argument is plausible without being able to distinguish reasoning from sophistry, I believe it will not be improper, before I conclude, to give a short, but an effectual answer, to the curious remarks, which I meet with in the second part of *Bower's* answer, and from which he would *demonstrate* the forgery of the letters; and then to produce some new, and very important *evidence*, which I hope, may be of such weight as to convince those who have not, as yet, formed a judgment of the character of this *prodigy* of man.

good dispositions, and they according to *real* (tho' mistaken) *persuasion*, and without any tenderness of nature to struggle with. — One of the letters to *Sheldon* (the sixth) shews something of this casuistry. — And yet this man, after all he says of himself, has the modesty to expect that his oath should be more credited than the strongest proofs!

I

From

From Mr. Bower's omission of the capital charge, in the *first part* of his answer, so long expected, and so bulky. I had formed an opinion that he himself saw the necessity of blinding the eyes of Protestants by an artful change of the question, conscious that what he had to offer against the genuineness of the letters, could give no satisfaction. My opinion has appeared to be well founded; for upon perusing his *second part* I find his boasted *demonstration* of the *forgery* of the letters, to be a most convincing proof of his inability to destroy their authenticity; and that he hath offered little or nothing, upon that head, but what he had, without any success, already laid before the public, last Summer, in his *remarks on the Six Letters*, printed at the end of his affidavit. But tho' it might be sufficient, by way of compleat answer to the repetition of this stale fare, is to refer the reader to my first pamphlet, I shall throw out some few short animadversions which will shew the inclusiveness, and expose the absurdity of Mr. Bower's boasted *demonstration*.

His first plea is this, that if he wrote the letters to Seldon; he, as well as the rest of the Jesuits believed him reconciled to the church — that had he been reconciled to the church, he must have been present at mass, and have said it, as a Priest and Jesuit, if reconciled to the order. But that he challenges the whole body of Papists, Priests and Jesuits to say they ever saw him at mass, or were present when he said it, during the time father Seldon, is supposed to have corresponded with him as a penitent (1). — Wonderful demonstration! Mr. Bower never went to mass, nor said it, during the time he is supposed to have been reconciled to Pope-

(1) Second part, p. 1. 2.

ry—

ty — therefore, he was no Papist (1). Where is the consequence? Has he never heard, or does he think that Protestants have never heard, of *Popish* emissaries, here in *England*, who could make the same defense? How often has it not been thought prudent, and useful to the interests of the church of *Rome* in this country, that persons, actually serving its cause, should not only be excused from being at Mass, or from saying it, but even that they should be allowed to wear the disguise of Protestantism, nay even, that they may strike a more effectual blow, to assume the character of Protestant teachers? The detection of *Faithful Commun* (2) a *Dominican* friar, and of *Thomas Heath*

(1) Were I to challenge Mr. Bower to produce any one Protestant who saw him receive the Sacrament, for several years after he says he joined in communion with the church of *England*, I believe I should puzzle him, nor would he think this a decisive test by which to try the sincerity of his conversion. That he has received the sacrament in our church, I readily admit. But as he tells us he was a long while only a Christian at large, and of no modern Communion, I should be glad to know whether he participated more antique, as *Pliny* tells us the Christian converts of his time did, who made it the *testera* of their engagements to leave off their pagans customs of lying, whoring, drinking, &c. And I am the more curious in this matter, because I have heard of a famous *modern missionary*, who obliged his convert from Popery, to revive this primitive practice, and fortify himself, in this manner, against an inveterate propensity he had to frequent certain places of *Civil Resort*.

(2) This man pretended to be a Puritan preacher in queen *Elizabeth's* reign, and was much admired and followed by the people for his seeming piety, but more particularly for inveighing in the pulpit against the Pope. He was detected in 1567, and his examination before the queen in council, by archbishop *Parker*, is extant in several collections. *Commun* has the very same plea with father *Bower*. There are several (says he to the Archbishop) have heard my prayers and my sermons, and can testify that I have spoken

Heath (1) a Jesuit, both of them impostors of this kind, is well known to those versed in the *English* history. These two worthy predecessors of our hero, had it in their power not only to challenge the Papists to produce any one who had seen them at Mals, but, had this been any justification of their conduct, they had it in their power, to produce Protestants who could testify that they had heard them preach against *Popery*.

I had no intention to make farther use of *Sheldon's* correspondence, besides giving the three instances to prove that *Jesuits* have private settlements and separate incomes; but *Mr. Bower* having insisted so strongly on his absenting from Mals as a proof that he was no Papist, I cannot avoid laying before the public a more striking instance than that just mentioned, to

against *Rome* and her Pope, as much as any of the clergy have since they have fallen from her; I wonder, therefore, why I should be suspected. — This examination of our friar, may be read in a pamphlet called *Foxes and Firebrands*; the author of which has the following note upon the above speech of *Commin*, 'They that rail most bitterly against *Rome* and her Pope, may be Papists notwithstanding.'

(2) *Thomas Heath*, after preaching above six years, as a Protestant, was discovered in 1568, to be a Popish emissary, by dropping a letter from abroad out of his pocket in the pulpit of *Rocheſter* cathedral, where he had preached. A narrative of this, copied from the registry of the episcopal see of *Rocheſter*, may be seen in *Foxes and Firebrands*. — Upon *Heath's* examination before the bishop of *Rocheſter*, he pretended to defend himself, by insisting upon his having retired from the *Jesuits*; but the letter found in that pulpit being produced, and a bull of Pope *Pius V.* and a licence from the *Jesuits*, being found at his lodging, he then threw off the mask saying, *ſeing my vocation is ſo publicly known, I ſhall not acknowledge myſelf to be guilty of any miſdemeanour; for I have fought a good fight for Chriſt, whoſe cauſe I have taken in hand.* — *Mr. Heath*, was pilloryed, and died in priſon.

prove

prove that *Bower* knows he is imposing upon Protestants in what he has asserted on this head. In *Sheldon's* correspondence, I find a letter to him, dated Durham, May 3d, 1745, from one *Thomas Waterton*, from which the following period is copied. *A virtuous young man whose name is J—n H—n, living at Durham, flatters himself, that he may be received at the hour of death, and hopes you will confirm the promise made him by all your predecessors.* — This remarkable letter needs no comment, and from this the reader cannot avoid drawing this consequence, that while the *Romish* Profelytes in this country are allowed to wear such disguises, Mr. *Bower* might have been an honest Papist without going to Mass, or saying it; and may, for aught that we can know to the contrary, flatter himself as *J—n H—n* did, that he may be *received at the hour of death*, even after having worn the character of a *writer against Popery*.

But admitting that our conscientious convert had no formal dispensation from his *Jesuit* superior, to neglect his duty as a priest, to *talk the same language* as he had done before, and to lead the life of a *Protestant and of a Layman*, after his readmission into their body in 1744, or 1745, this inconsistent conduct in *Bower*, as well as the *Jesuits* bearing with it in some degree, notwithstanding all the plausibility of his sophistry, may easily be accounted for. — The church of *Rome*, like other churches, abounds with *Profligates*. In this it differs from other churches, that it promises so much to those within its pale, to the *opus operatum*, and to the operation of the priest, that wicked men rarely get free of those superstitious Ties which promise so much, and which they are taught to think are so reconcileable to their practices. But the Protestant churches affording no grounds for these delusive hopes, *Profligates* in that community break with them in good earnest, despise their ordinances

nanities, and set up for thorough unbelievers. --- A Catholic Prebinder shall to day violate the ordinances of his church, and laugh at its doctrine, and tomorrow make a good cautionary provision of an absolution. Suppose *Bower* then only to have done what he is charged with doing, run away from his church for fear of punishment, professed Protestantism for his accommodation, for his convenience; his superstition and fear of the devil (very consistent with profligacy of manners) still remaining, and all the pretended inconsistency vanishes. --- As to the *Jesuits* bearing with his disguise, hypocrisy and dissimulation, his pretended community with the church of *England*, and the like, he himself has removed that difficulty by the account he gives us of the ardent and incessant endeavors of that body to recover its strayed members, the door of forgiveness never being shut. --- Not to say their unwillingness to exasperate a man supported by people in power, in a country where they lye under such severe laws; an unwillingness which still continues, and depending on the continuance of which, Mr. *Bower* thinks he may safely deny his handwriting, and say any thing, or swear any thing, without having any additional proofs of his imposture, exposed by his polite brethren, to Protestants.

The next decisive argument made use of to demonstrate, that Mr. *Bower* did not write the letters is--- that it was not for his interest to return to the *Jesuits*, because whatever he possessed would then become no longer his but the order's, and that he must have acted like a fool and a madman to have accepted of 30 £. per an: which he says is all that the order allows to any of its missionaries (1). Admitting his representation of this matter to be agreeable to truth --- this argument is just as conclusive against his having had intentions of returning to

the *Jesuits*, as it would be in a deserter from the *British* troops to the *Irish* brigade, to urge, in opposition to positive evidence of the fact, that he could not be supposed capable of acting so like a *fool and a madman*, as to have deserted from a service where he had sixpence a day, to one where he could expect only half that pay. --- But indeed, the truth of the matter is this, Mr. *Bower* knows very well, that he might have gone back to his order, without losing his annuity; and the reader will also know this to be certain, if he looks back to the extracts which I have given from the papers of father *Sheldon*. Mr. *Bower* might enjoy the benefit of his own money during his life, as well as father *Murphy* who receives the interest of the thousand pounds left by his patroness, or father *Conyers* who had been promised 8 or 9 per cent, for his own money from *Shireburn*, and tells *Sheldon* *I shall be satisfied with 5, to be paid quarterly*. --- The evidence of another venerable father of the order may also be produced on this occasion. --- I mean that of the very consistent father *Bower* himself, who in his first part (1), says --- *Should I offer to return to the Jesuits even now, they would readily allow me, if I required it, to dispose of all I am worth to whom I pleased, and receive me again with open arms into the society*. --- If then the *Jesuits* would, according to Mr. *Bower*, allow him to dispose of all his money to whom he pleased, is it, at all likely, that they would refuse, upon his putting it into their hands, to pay him some consideration for it, during the few years he may have to live? And, therefore, what are we think, of our conscientious convert, who can produce arguments, so totally groundless, and so inconsistent with his own concessions?

We are next told, that, at the time he is supposed to have written to his provincial, *that he submits himself entirely to his will, and is quite indifferent as to places*, he was actually engaged in a treaty of marriage, as many persons

persons of unexceptionable veracity, are ready to attest (1). — Strange! that he should be so extremely off his guard as to urge, as an argument of the letters being forged, a circumstance which every sensible reader will look upon as a proof of their being genuine. For that he had formed a resolution of breaking with the *Jesuits*, when he wrote so pressingly about getting his money from them, I had observed in my first pamphlet (2), to be the only key to let us into the meaning of the letters, and to account for the *solicitude* of the writer. And speaking of his motives for leaving his old friends at that conjuncture, amongst other conjectures I supposed, what he now tells us himself was the case, that he might have taken a resolution to marry; and, therefore, he might want his money *in order to enable him to make a settlement on his future spouse*.

His boasted plea so often repeated, of our not being able to produce a *woman and a child*, is again (3) brought upon the carpet, as a demonstrative proof that the letters in which they are mentioned, could not be written by him. So Mr. *Bower* reasons, but few will think much to the purpose. — Among the various *female* connexions which, it appears, this pattern of *chastity* hath had (and three or four of which we have discovered already) is it a wonder that *another* may have existed, about which we are still in the dark? — But admitting that the woman and child never existed, but in the *Six Letters*, I should incline to believe that Mr. *Bower* put them there, rather than a forger assuming Mr. *Bower's* name. For what could induce forgers of letters to tell a story of a *woman and child* that can no where be found? Is it not improbable that a forger should have ever thought of this odd conceits? — Or will our worthy convert rest his defense upon this point, that, in no one instance,

(1) Second Part, p. 9.

(2) See *Six Letters illustrated*, p. 34-35.

(3) Second Part, p. 9-10.

he ever departed from truth? The view which we have taken of his character, shews how little scrupulous he has generally been of saying, or writing any thing which might serve his purpose. Now we see a plain and obvious end that he could serve, by bringing a *woman and child* into existence, in his correspondence with *Sheldon*. He had formed, at that time, a resolution to break with the *Jesuits*; but first he was willing to get his money from them. He could not demand it as a right; much less did he care to lay open his real plan of conduct. What then doth he do? He represents himself as unhappily entangled with a woman; he pretends that he cannot perform his duty as a *Jesuit*, (which he offers to do most abjectly) till he gets free from her; and that he cannot get free from her, till he has paid her back the money which he seems to represent as hers. Such a plea as this, he might think, would alarm the conscience, and excite the compassion of his superior;---such a plea, therefore, naturally offered itself to one in Mr. *Bower's* circumstances, and I may add, to one of Mr. *Bower's* character.

But the ridiculous nature of his pretended *demonstration*, will be better exposed by illustration than by argument; and I think the following case is extremely similar. A man writes an incendiary letter, threatening fire and destruction, if a certain sum of money be not left at a place he names; and urges at the same time that he had a wife and child to provide for, which obliged him to have recourse to this desperate step. I shall suppose the writer of this letter brought to the *Old-Bailey*, and that, upon his trial, the fact is proved upon him; by all the evidence that can be expected. Will it have any weight with his jury, if he should urge, in his defence, that there are *false facts* in the letter said to be his; and, in particular, that he could not be the writer of it, because he never was married, and challenged his prosecutor to produce the *wife and the child*, which he was said to have? The very stating of the case shews the absurdity of such a plan of defence; and, consequently, must give the reader a clear view of the extreme weakness of Mr. *Bower's* cause, whose *demonstrations* are exactly of this kind.

The genuineness of the letters, then, cannot be affected by their containing of *false facts*; it would be greatly af-

fect, nay overturned, if he could prove, as he pretends, that they contain *false dates*. But his attempt to shew this, will serve only to exemplify his miserable chicanery. What, therefore, is it that he calls a false date? In the postscript to the sixth letter we read, as *to the place, it will be a fortnight before the patent is out*. Now this letter was written in March, 1746-7; and Mr. Bower's friends never applied for a place for him, till Mr. Say, keeper of the queen's library died, in September, 1748. — This is the charge, and this the proof. But every reader of common sense will see the fallacy here. There can be no pretence for calling this a *false date*, because we have nothing but Mr. Bower's own interpretation to make us believe, that the place hinted at in the sixth letter, is the place which Mr. Say enjoyed. — Mr. Bower, in his first defence, tells us, *that he had been twenty years in England before he thought of a bedfellow*. Am I to believe that Mr. Bower did not write this defence, because it appears from his two subsequent defences, that he had thought of a bedfellow more than once before this period? In the same manner, he must excuse us if we think, that possibly he may have had hopes of a place in 1747, although he be pleased to say, that he had not till the year after. But, admitting that the first place he ever applied for was Mr. Say's, the mention of a place in a letter of a prior date, will only prove what we have already shewn to be consistent with the genuineness of the letters, that there are *false facts* in them. For if we can only suppose the possibility of Mr. Bower's writing a lie, the plea of *false facts* can have no weight. The argument may be illustrated thus.

Mr. Bower upon the title-page of his history, calls himself counsellor of the inquisition at *Macerata*: Am I to believe that this title page is spurious, because I now know that Mr. Bower never had such a place? Mr. Bower, several years before Mr. Say's death, mentioned his having a place in *Greenwich hospital*; witnesses, who have heard this from his own mouth, can be produced; but must they be disbelieved, because now we know that no such place ever was enjoyed by him? Mr. Bower, to many of his acquaintance, hath boasted, that he was at law for a considerable estate. Am I to disbelieve this, because I now know

know that no such law-suit ever existed? Mr. *Bower* told many, that the compositor of Mr. *Richardson's* press had interpolated his book: Am I to disbelieve he said this, because the Fact never happened? Mr. *Bower* told a great prelate that he had left out several infidel passages in Mr. *Salé's* part of the *Universal History*: Am I to disbelieve unexceptionable testimony telling me he said this, because I now find the fact is absolutely false? If then so many *false facts* can be traced up to the mouth of this strange man, is it out of character in him to use the same liberty with his pen? And need we be surprised to find an *imaginary woman*, or an *imaginary place*, brought by him into a letter, when the end he drove at in this letter, the recovery of his money, could be promoted by such fictions. (1)

Besides the above very convincing arguments, to demonstrate the forgery of the letters, Mr. *Bower* is pleased to insist strongly upon the imprudence of his writing such letters to the provincial of the *Jesuits*, just before he published the preface to his History of the Popes, putting it thus in his power, and in the power of every *Jesuit*, to ruin his character with Protestants. (2) This argument, equally demonstrative with all the rest, (I mean of Mr. *Bower's* evasions, not of the forgery of the letters) had received a complete answer in my first pamphlet, and yet here we find him again retailing it. Without repeating what I have already said (3) on this head, it will sufficiently expose the folly of the plea, to observe, that if an accused person is to be allowed, by way of reply to positive proofs of his guilt, to insist upon the folly and imprudence of doing what he is accused of, the most notorious offender need not despair of being acquitted. This plea put into the mouth of the assassin *Damien* will demonstrate, (to use Mr. *Bower's* word) that he could not possibly stab the *French king*, though he was seized in the very act. But why do I lose sight of my own hero, whose own conduct, in

K 2

other

(1) It should seem that under the description of a patent, that was to be out in about a fortnight, *Bower* hints at his preface, which, about that time, was to be out from the press.

(2) Page 14.

(3) See six letters illust. page 55, 56, 57.

other instances, will sufficiently illustrate his curious method of *demonstrating* his innocence in this particular?

Is it to be believed that Mr. *Bower*, a sensible man, could be so imprudent as to put all his money into the hands of the *Jesuits*, after he had made them his inveterate enemies by leaving them, especially as he knew that the *Jesuits* (to use his own words) *will stick at nothing*, when the interest of their order interferes, and whom, consequently, he must have avoided having any connection with, if he were not a *fool or a madman*?

Is it possible to believe, that Mr. *Bower* could be *such a fool and a madman*, as to assert, that Mr. *Hill* offered him the same interest that was given by the trustees of St. *Buttolph's* church, when he himself tells us he had only 7l. per cent. from *Hill*, and the act of parliament tells us he might have had 8l. 1-half from the trustees? Or could Mr. *Bower* say, that *he came too late, and found that subscription closed before August 1741*, when it can be proved from the *parish books*, that the subscription was not closed till a year after? (1)

Is it to be believed that Mr. *Bower*, a sensible man, could be so imprudent, as to allow himself to be entangled with *two or three* women, at one and the same time? Could he be ignorant of the legal remedies which might be had to punish him in his pocket? Could he imagine that

(1) This remarkable detection of Mr. *Bower's* imposture, has been made since that part of my pamphlet was printed off, where I treat of the money transaction. I can now take upon me to assure the public, that Mr. *Bower's* journey into the city to lend his money at St. *Buttolph's*, his coming too late and finding that subscription closed, and his accidental meeting with Mr. *Hill* at Will's coffee-house, as related in p. 102 of his first defence, are fictions of the inventive imagination of a man, who appears to be capable of saying any thing where he thinks he shall not be traced. But he has been traced to the parish books of St. *Buttolph's*, and it appears from them that the trustees began to take in subscriptions very early in 1741, at 8l. 1-half per cent. and did not finish till the 2d of December, 1742. This instance of our worthy convert's adherence to truth, is recommended to the consideration of his patrons, whose eyes surely will be opened at last, if they are not incurably blind.

the discovery of his exemplary conduct in this instance would not blast his reputation? And could he expect that, sooner or later, the discovery would not be made?

Is it to be believed that Mr. *Bower* could be so imprudent as to appeal to *Piazza*, as agreeing entirely with him in the account given of the country clergyman, when, by so doing, he put it in the power of every body to see that there was no such agreement; and, consequently, that his inquisition adventures at *Macerata* were a romance, pieced together for the amusement of Protestants?

Again: Is it possible to believe, that Mr. *Bower* could be guilty of the shameless plagiarism of *Tillemont*, charged upon him? That he who had taken so much pains to raise the expectations of the *British* nation, by promises of discoveries, fatal to popery; he who had solemnly disclaimed the assistance of moderns, in his history of the ancient popes; he who never once cites *Tillemont* as an Authority, amidst the numerous list of authors which crowd his page; is it possible to believe that he could act so like a fool and a madman, as to translate servilely almost all his first volume from *Tillemont*, an author, whom Protestants, ignorant as he must suppose them, could not but have in their hands? Could he be so imprudent as to put it in every body's power to trace his impostures? Could he take a more effectual way to enable the *Jesuits* to ruin his character with Protestants, than to give them ample materials, by comparing his history with *Tillemont's* memoirs, to satisfy the world that the formidable champion of the reformation was an unlicensed and illiterate plagiarist? And can it be necessary to offer any other consideration to demonstrate that so improbable a charge, is a plain and palpable forgery?— Thus may our ingenious historian assert his innocence, and observe, "That a sensible man cannot well be supposed to act like a natural fool or madman, when his credit, his interest, his all is at stake." (1) But, unfortunately, there is one trifling circumstance, which some weak people may look upon as an answer to this boasted demonstration. The facts charged upon him cannot be denied; and the greatness of the improbability can serve only to give us a more perfect idea of the blackness of his hypocrisy, and of the extent of his impostures.

The

The last argument which he produces to prove that he did not write the six letters is this---*That, if he had writ them, he would have taken care to prevent their ever being shewn to any living soul. I needed only, says he, to have prefixed to each letter, the word SOLI, to you alone.*---Thus the Jesuits write to their superiors, when they want the contents of their letters to be kept secret. (1) Here again Mr. Bower is in hopes to avail himself of Protestant ignorance; but he should have remembered, that from the very nature of his correspondence with Sheldon, it would have been absurd in him to prefix *soli* to his letters. For they not only related to a matter, public in their body, the annuity paid to him; but also, by Sheldon's absconding, the Jesuits in London must necessarily be employed by both, as the instruments in carrying on the correspondence, and consequently must have been privy to the whole affair.---Weak must be his cause, when he can urge an argument, which at first sight is so groundless. And I shall only add, that Mr. Bower seems entirely to have forgot himself when he says, that the prefixing the word *soli* would have prevented his letters from being shewn to any living soul.---He has told us, that the Jesuits will stick at nothing to advance the interest of their order; and if he knew this, he must know that *soli* could not prevent the publication of his letters, if such a publication should be thought expedient, by persons who, as he represents them, have no tie but interest.

And now having so effectually exposed the miserable evasions which Mr. Bower hath offered under the name of *demonstration*, I believe every reader of common sense will agree with me, that he had better have followed the friendly advice which I formerly gave him, to entrench himself behind his *affidavits*. By descending to particulars, and by attempting, as he has done, to prove *truth to be falsehood*, he has only added new force to the evidences of his guilt; whereas, had he contented himself with sounding the alarm of a *Papish plot*, without pretending to reason upon it, no such misfortune could have happened to him; and the reader, without finding new proofs of Mr. Bower's guilt, under his own hand, would only have found occasion of mirth, by calling to mind the like cry of the memorable astrologer John Partridge, who could smell *France and Rome* at the

bot-

bottom of *Isaac Bickerstaff's* humorous attack upon his valuable prognostications. Indeed there is one small difference between the two cases; the *Protestant* almanac-maker's understanding was so weak, that he believed what he said on that head; the *Papish-Protestant* historian insults our understandings, as he himself *knows*, and the impartial reader is convinced of the falsity of the pretence.

But if this be a *Papish* plot against Mr. Bower, by his own account of it, it is the strangest plot that ever was hatched by *Rome*. For he tells us (1) that *he does not believe, that there was at first, or for a long time, any intention that the letters should become the talk of the public, or be seen by any Protestants; but that he believes they were designed for the use of the Catholics, to discredit with them the history of the Popes, and hurt his character among persons to whom he was not well known.* If, therefore, the letters were neither designed for the talk of the publick, nor for the inspection of Protestants, but to discredit Mr. Bower among persons who knew him not: this key will wonderfully account for the unnecessary pains which, it seems, were taken to imitate his hand-writing; for the obscurity of the correspondence, and for there being no external proofs, unsubscribed and undirected as these letters are, either that *Archibald Bower* wrote them, or that he wrote them to father *Sheldon*. Nay, further, the letters were not, it seems, as Mr. Bower's enemies might misrepresent, *forged*, to discredit the history of the Popes with *Protestants*, but with the *Catholics*; who, no doubt, might be staggered in their faith, by a book which had disclosed the secrets hitherto hid in *Tillemant*, and other enemies of their own church.

What Mr. Bower says of the *forgers* of the letters is equally curious with what he says about the intention of the *forgery*. *I believe*, says he, *that ninety-nine in a hundred of the Roman Catholics in this kingdom, and particularly the gentleman in whose possession they are, are as incapable of having forged them, or of countenancing such a forgery, as any of my friends would be to forge letters against them.*---He will not even, so candid is he, accuse father *Sheldon* of having been knowingly concerned in the fraud, how freely soever his

his name has been used in this ugly affair.---So that he acquits those, who are the only persons whom he can have any pretence for accusing; and the upshot of all is, that he believes there are Jesuits and other missionaries here, very capable of employing such black means of defaming him. And, indeed, I must so far agree with him, that there is one Jesuit on whom all this mischief may be laid; one whose conduct in this whole affair has been visibly calculated to ruin Mr. Bower.---I mean the person, whoever he was, who, under his name, has made affidavits, to deny facts unquestionably well attested; and has written defences so full of provarication and inconsistencies, of quibbling sophistry and barefaced falsehood, that one would think that they could come only from the pen of some disguised Jesuit, wounding the Protestant Historian under the mask of friendship.

Were I to hazard a conjecture as to the motives which may have induced Mr. Bower to speak in such high terms of praise, of ninety-nine in a hundred of the Roman Catholics, and to give such a ridiculous key to the Popish plot against him; I should say that he was desirous, if possible, of purchasing a reprieve from those who have the means in their power of increasing the evidence of his guilt. He needed not have been at so much pains to stop the mouths of the Jesuits, who, from the very beginning, have shewn a remarkable backwardness to assist his enemies. But whatever effect his soothing compliments may have upon his brethren, what I have already said in this confutation, shews that they have had no effect upon me; and as a further proof of this, I shall now proceed to lay before the public some new evidence, to confirm the charge brought against him.

I shall first present the reader with a letter from Sir Henry Badingfield, the original of which, written to a learned protestant, has been put into my hands; and as the intelligence contained in it is very important, so will its authority be very decisive, not only with the public in general, who cannot be strangers to the acknowledged probity and honour of the writer, but also with Mr. Bower himself, who is forced, as we have seen above, to do justice to a character, which he knew to be superior to all the efforts of calumny and abuse.

SIR,

SIR,

I CAN very safely declare now, as I have often done, that my conduct, in regard to the affair of Mr. *Bower*, has been strictly honest, and totally disinterested. And though I hear there are some persons who seem to be of a different opinion, this treatment, as well as some *unbecoming* expressions of Mr. *B.* in his last performance, p. 17. being of such a nature, and coming from such a quarter, is beneath my resentment, and only the object of my contempt.—Had the affair come into Westminster-Hall, (the most proper place, in my opinion, for discovering either impostures or forgeries) I should then have produced witnesses, as I can now, of some surprising and very interesting facts. One of the witnesses, if called upon before proper judges, would have deposed upon oath, what he has frequently and very lately told me, and others, in conversation, that he received from Mr. *A. B.*'s own hand, a letter to father *Sheldon*; and that another letter was either delivered him by Mr. *B.* or left by him at his lodgings (I suppose with his landlord) to be given him; both which letters he sent, and directed to father *Sheldon*, under the feigned name of *Elliot Brown*. The same person upon seeing those two letters in my custody, owns the direction to be of his own handwriting. Mr. *Bower* will easily recollect the gentleman's name, when I mention it is the same person who furnished him with all the books he could, when he begun, (or at least pretended to begin) his history of the Popes in their favour; which books were sent by a porter to Mr. *Bower*, and were returned again, at Mr. *Lewis*'s, the bookseller's request, when Mr. *Bower* had done with them.

There is another person who can also attest that he introduced Mr. *B.* to father *Shirburn*, then provincial of the *Jesuits*; was present when Mr. *Bower* made a very handsome and well worded apology for his past conduct; remembers his being kindly received, and offering his money for an annuity; for which affair Mr. *Shirburn* referred him to father *Hill*.

L

Having

Having, at last, within these few months, got into my possession another letter, signed A. B. (I suppose *Abraham Broomstick*) dated the 27th of March, 1747, which any one may see, without the assistance of an *Ananias*, was writ by the same hand with the other six; I can add, in support of its authenticity, that I have also the affidavit of the person in whose room that letter was written, who saw A. B. write it, heard him read it, and was desired by him to send it to father *Sheldon*. This affidavit, as particular and authentic as can be supposed, also informs me, that Mr. A. B. and Mr. *Sheldon*, had transactions together, and that the very person who makes this affidavit, was employed by both of them in those transactions. It is pleasant indeed to hear this man appeal to the testimony of priests and Jesuits for the truth of what he asserts, and pretend, at the same time, to deny that privilege to his antagonist; nay farther, to affirm that their evidence ought not have any weight, or any ways to be regarded. Such an assertion, so contrary to the known laws and practice of this kingdom, seems to me to border a little upon presumption, and if the word was not a little harsh, I would add arrogance. But as that is the unfortunate gentleman's only plea, his chief anchor, I think one may over-look and despise it.

As I now despair seeing this matter canvassed in its proper place, I could not conceal any longer from you the above facts, which, I believe, you will think with me, are something strong, as well as the certificate of the notary of the inquisition, which you have seen. I leave you at liberty to make what use you may think proper of them; though I cannot help being of opinion, that there has already been a great deal more published than what was needful to prove the authenticity of the letters.

I am, SIR,
 Your most obedient, humble Servant,
 H. BADINGFELD.
 Oxburgh, Feb. 12, 1757.

Though

Though I entirely agree with the honourable gentleman who writes the above letter, that enough hath been published already to prove the authenticity of the correspondence with *Sheldon*; I think that the intelligence which I have communicated, in his words, will be of great weight to convince those few who are still of a different opinion. If it should be asked why the witnesses whom he can produce, and who are both, at present, in *London*, have not voluntarily offered that testimony to the public, which, when called upon, in a legal way, they have it in their power to give, this will be hardly accounted for upon Mr. *Bower's* plan of a Jesuit plot; but will appear very natural, upon my representation of the case, which is supported by a variety of circumstances, that the *Jesuits*, far from wishing, or promoting the detection of their worthy brother, have absolutely refused to give up many evidences of his impostures, known to be in their hands; and that those lights which they have given to confirm the authenticity of his letters to *Sheldon*, they have given sparingly, and with reluctance, and only to comply with the solicitation of a person of figure of their communion, who hath, fortunately for the sake of truth, and for the satisfaction of Protestants, thought himself under a necessity, in consequence of the unparliamentary behaviour of some persons, to go a great deal farther in this affair, than, I believe, he at first intended; and to use Mr. *Bower's* own words, further than some of the wisest of the PAPISTS (amongst which number he can not but include his Jesuit friends) think he ought to have done. (1)

But though the witnesses appealed to by Sir *Henry Bellingfield* have, for the above obvious reasons, endeavoured to escape our attention, we shall find the name of one of them mentioned, by and by, in a most authentic manner; and the inquisitive reader has a key put into his hands, by means of which he may know who the other is. For whoever will take the trouble to enquire, in *Russel-street*, of the (2) person who was employed by the *Jesuits* to get back their books from Mr. *Bower*, will be a judge what degree of regard is to be paid to this man's positive assertion, that Mr. *CARTERET* and Mr. *HILL* are the only *JESUITS* whom

(1) Second Part, p. 23.

(2) Upon enquiry I have learnt that *Barrow* was one of these books.

be acquainted with on the subject, in question are
 supposed to have been written. But though the testimo-
 ny of so honest a man as Mr. Lewis, he desires as to the
 fallacy of this assertion, as a farther confirmation of Mr.
 Bower's impudent denial of a notorious fact, a gentleman of
 rank, in Upper Bracke Street, remembers well to have been
 present in Mr. Lewis's shop, about the end of August,
 1746, when he heard Mr. Bower say to a Jesuit, a chap-
 lain of a foreign minister, one whose name was neither
 Carrer nor Hill. — *Mr. — we can never find you at
 home; and heard the Jesuit's answer, 'Mr. Bower, you
 know my hour.'* This piece of intelligence has been
 freely communicated by this gentleman to his acquaintances
 in private conversation, and particularly to Sir Henry Be-
 dingfeld. But though the Jesuit be deceased, his views in thus disclaiming, so contrary to
 positive proof, all acquaintance with any of the Jesuits now
 alive, are easily discovered, when we learn from Sir Henry
 Bedingfeld's letter, that two of them, still upon the spot,
 can be produced as witnesses to confound his imposture,
 and from one of whom, if I can depend upon my informa-
 tion, he hath, more than once, received more signal fa-
 vours than the introducing him to Father Shickura. This
 worthy convert, when he challenged the Jesuit to produce
 any one who had ever seen him at mass, since his re-adi-
 mission in 1744 or 1745, did not think proper to say any
 thing of his not being, since that period, a *confessor*. This
 part of his religious duty he could perform, without run-
 ning any risk of being suspected by Protestants, and this
 ceremony, so necessary to wash out the stains of his *frail-
 ties and follies*, and so atone for his acknowledged depar-
 ture from the purity and sanctity of the gospel (in his fre-
 quenting houses of civil reception) he knows he has perform-
 ed *often* than once within these twelve years, and may re-
 ceive an authentic certificate of it, if he pleases, from the
 same father, to whom he addressed himself, as above, in
 Lewis's shop; who, though Mr. Bower will hardly ever
 find him giving a *public testimony*, even against so *sincere* a
 penitent, hath related this remarkable fact to many gentle-
 men of worth, on the authority of one of whom I have
 thought myself warranted to mention it.

As to the affidavit which Sir Henry Bedingfield speaks of, I shall only say, that several Protestants of learning and eminence, who have had it in their hands, have seen that it has every possible external mark of authenticity, and that it comes up, in the fullest manner, to the account which he giveth of it. But the same reasons which have induced Mr. Bower's old friends to think of keeping some measures with him, by withholding much evidence which they have in their possession, seem to have put it out of Sir Henry Bedingfield's power to make the most of the evidence which he hath in his hands, and to give to the public, in general, that full satisfaction on this head, which every friend, and I believe, every gentleman who can be recommended to him, will readily receive.

But though the Jesuits be so averse to join in the detection of their worthy brother, he will have no reason to triumph in our want of evidence to convict him. For I shall now produce a witness, whose testimony Mr. Bower will read with confusion, Mr. Bower's patrons admit with respect, and the public pay more regard to, than to a hundred affidavits of one who avows the horrid doctrine of *mental abjection*.

William Sheldon, Esq, a gentleman whose amiable character endears him to all his acquaintance, and whose acquaintances are of the first distinction in this kingdom, tho' at the beginning of this debate concerning Mr. Bower's correspondence with his brother, father *Sheldon*, he declined entering into any particulars of what he knew about the affair, when asked by his friends, hath lately, at the desire of Sir Henry Bedingfield, given his consent, that his testimony should be appealed to, in the most public manner. And his testimony is decisive of the whole controversy. For he knows, at the very time, of the correspondence between Bower and his brother, who shewing him one of Bower's letters, in which was mentioned the woman pressing to have her money, desired his opinion what to do; and his answer was, *Let him have the money, and get rid of him.* These are the very terms in which Sir Henry Bedingfield expressed what Mr. Sheldon had told him, on the 24th of January last; and in confirmation of it, I shall now produce what the reader will still pay more regard to, a letter under Mr. Sheldon's own hand to a friend in town, who hath been

been pleased to put the original into my possession, and which is as follows.

Feb. 7. 1757.

Dear Sir,

I must beg the favour of you to pay my compliment to Sir H--- B---, and desire him to be cautious not to insert any thing more from the intelligence he had from me, concerning Mr. B---, than I can justify. I never had the perusal of B---'s letter to my brother, nor did I see his name to it; my brother told me it was from him, by which he desired to have his money repaid him, in order to provide for the woman, before he could return. My brother then asked my advice whether he should pay it or not, I told him I thought it was best to pay it, making proper deductions, and that it was my opinion, when once the money was paid, he would hear no more of his return. This is all I know of the matter, as I desire you will inform Sir Harry.

I am, Sir,

Your humble servant,

WM. SHELTON.

The reader having, by this time, received the most authentic proofs, which, in the nature of the thing, are possible, of the genuineness of the correspondence with father Sheldon, I shall now gratify his curiosity, by the publication of a fourth letter, (written by the same hand, and to the same person) the same which Sir Henry Dering-
ford mentions as having come lately into his possession.

Dear Sir,

March 27. (1) 1747.

I have taken, it is true, one desperate step, but it is not irretrievable; and I call God to witness, I am

(1) Two days after the date which appears on Mr. Bower's

pre-

ready to retrieve it, having been the most miserable and unhappy wretch upon earth, ever since I took it. But I must immediately withdraw from hence. Shall I do it without satisfying, or acquainting the woman and her relations? If you approve of it, I am ready to go where you please. My dear friend Mr. Cartret would receive me with open arms. Could I any ways satisfy the woman, I might in that case retire without trouble or noise. If in this you can help me, for Christ Jesus's sake don't delay it. My dearest friend, your letter has revived me, it gives me some hopes of being still saved by your means, and I heartily wish I had not been so rash in complying with those who believe themselves my friends. I sincerely repent what I have done, and with God's grace shall proceed in it no farther. The moment I am free, I shall be entirely at your disposal, and with infinite satisfaction obey your commands. *Ecce ego mitto me.*

Dear S I R,

I am your most oblig'd, humble Servant,

A. B.

Though the copy of this letter, which I have made use of, was not taken from the original, nor communicated by Sir Henry Bedingsfeld, he hath allowed them to be collated together, and which, as I observed in my first pamphlet, is, in all probability, the date of its being sent to the press, and not the date of its publication, as Mr. Bower artfully, and without any evidence, asserts, page 20 of his second part. This letter, from the contents, appears to be subsequent to the sixth, which we may guess to have been written about the 20th of March, as it seems to have produced the letter from Sheldon, which gave Mr. Bower *some hopes of being saved by his means*; and to which this seventh letter was an immediate answer.—Bower in his sixth letter had given Sheldon a fortnight, within which time the repayment of the money could prevent *his utter ruin*; which fortnight, we may observe, did not elapse till some time after the 27th of March, and I defy our historian to prove, that his preface was *publ'd* sooner,

together, so that I can answer for the exactness of what I publish. I have it also in my power to say, that many gentlemen, upon seeing the original, have been struck with the same similitude of hand, which induced them to ascribe the other six letters to Mr. *Bower*, whose writing they are intimately well acquainted with.

But if, in opposition to the *internal* marks of genuineness, so conspicuous in this, and in the other six letters, to every reader whatever; if, in opposition to the most striking similitude of hands, (1) visible to every one who is acquainted with Mr. *Bower's* writing, or will compare the specimens; if, in opposition to positive proof tracing up the letters in question, to Mr. *Bower's* sending them, and to Mr. *Sheldon's* shewing and speaking of them; if, I say, in opposition to this commanding evidence, the modesty of my antagonist shall permit him to urge against the genuineness of this letter, the same curious *demonstrations* which have been urged against the other six, I shall leave such sorry pleas to the contempt of every Person of common sense, and content myself with addressing myself to him, in the words of *Apuleius*, in his apology, who, if *Bower* had been his antagonist, could not have said any thing more apposite to the present purpose.---*Estne hæc tua epistola? Quid palluisti? (nam erubescere tu quidem non potes) Estne tua ista subscripta? Recita quæso clarius, ut omnes intelligant quantum lingua ejus manu discrepet, quantumque minor illi*

(1) 'Proofs must be very strong that will counterbalance
' similitude of hand. To write a name, so as to deceive is
' easy; to write a line is possible; to write a letter, and even
' six letters, in an imitated hand with success, I believe no
' man will undertake: Similitude of hand, if there be a suf-
' ficient quantity of writing to be compared, is a physical tes-
' timony, perhaps irrefragably cogent.' Such is the verdict
of a masterly writer on the very point. I beg leave to add,
that the pretended fact, so confidently asserted even in courts
of justice (see *Alger. Sydney's* trial) of long writings forged
with an exact similitude of hands, has never yet been shewn.
The forging *long deeds* has been talked of, and lately, in the
forgery of *Barnsley's* will and deeds by *Mansel Powell's* agent;
but when the will and deeds came to be examined and com-
pared with undoubted specimens of *Barnsley's* writing, there
appeared a very faint resemblance. See the printed account
of the case.

illi sit mecum quam secum dissentio. Is not this thy letter? why dost thou turn pale? (for thou canst not blush) Is not this thy hand-writing? Read it aloud, that every one may understand how much his tongue disagrees with his pen, and how much more he is at variance with himself than he is with me." *Apuleius's* hero had not, it seems, the presence of mind, to avail himself of the plea of forgery, set up by mine, who by his whole conduct in this affair, well deserves to have a second scrap of Latin, from the same author, submitted to his perusal, and applied to his case. *Nescisti impræbe epistolam tuam de ista retineri: nescisti te tuomet testimonio convictum iri. Quam tamen epistolam— testem & indicem tuæ voluntatis; ut qui te levem & mutabilem nec minus mendacem & impudentem sciret, maluit retinere quam mittere.* Which for the benefit of the English reader may be paraphrased as follows— 'Wretch that thou art! thou didst not know that thy letters were preserved; thou didst not know that thou wouldst be confuted by thy own testimony. But thy correspondent, who knew thy real character, and saw thy fickleness and inconsistency, to be equal to thy falsehood and impudence, chose to preserve them, that they might stand up in judgment against thee.'

The reader will, no doubt, by this time, begin to expect that I should take into consideration Mr. *Bower's* objections to Mrs. *Hoyle's*, whose evidence he is pleased to postpone, till he comes to his postscript, as if one of the most material witnesses (1) to prove the charge brought against him, scarcely deserved an answer. But it is no wonder that he should have so much reluctance to enter into the examination of her evidence, as he has been pleased totally to omit, in all his answers and defences, the least mention of Mr. *Horne*, who was (2) produced as a witness to prove, that our convert was reconciled to Popery by father *Carteret*. Indeed silence is the best answer, when nothing can be said without departing from truth; and what shall now follow, will shew that Mr. *Bower* would have acted more prudently, if he had treated Mrs. *Hoyle's*

M with

(1) See the six letters illustrat. from p. 75 to 78.

(2) See the six letters illustrat. p. 82.

with the same dumb neglect which Mr. *Horne* has met with. (3)

From Mr. *Bower's* own account of the intrigue with Mrs. *Sutton*, we have already seen, that he owns too much for a virtuous and good man; and now we shall see that, from his own account of the conversion of Mrs. *Hoyles*, he owns too much for a sincere Protestant. For he tells us, *that possibly he may have spoke in her company (as he still thinks himself bound in candour to speak) of the SPIRITUAL EXERCISES used by the Jesuits, and some other institutions of the order, or of the church of Rome, as pious in themselves, and conducive to holiness. Nay,---he may also have defended that church, when unjustly accused of holding opinions she does not hold.* (4) But I shall not offer at any remarks on this part of Mr. *Bower's* performance, which will be answered more effectually by Mrs. *Hoyles* herself. I shall only beg leave to observe, that if she be a *filly woman*, as he is pleased to say, she is not the less likely to speak truth on that account; and, perhaps, it may occur to my readers, that St *Paul's* description of some persons *having a form of godliness, but who deny the power of it, and creep into houses, and lead captive filly women*, may without much impropriety be applied to Mr. *Bower* himself. But that Mrs. *Hoyles* is the *weak, filly woman* that Mr. *Bower* represents her to be, is an assertion, which, however it may be for his purpose, will, in my opinion, be found to be equally groundless with many other of this bold man's assertions in the course of

(3) The evidence of Mr. *John Gay*, which is given in my first pamphlet, p. 83-4, is also taken no notice of by *Bower*. I mentioned, that *Gay* seemed to know a great deal more than he cared to speak of, and as a proof of my conjecture, I beg leave to inform the public, that no longer since than on Sunday the 20th of February, Mr. *Gay* told Mr. *Edwards*, tobaccoist in St. Martin's Court, *that he had been in the room when Mr. Bower said mass, bers in London, and that this mass was served by Father Turberville.*—Mr. *Bower*, it appears now, had very good reasons for not challenging the Papists to produce any witness of his performing his priestly function before 1744, and, we now see very strong reasons for his declaring, what Protestants never knew before, that he was so much a Jesuit, since his coming into this country, as to *say mass*.

(4) Second part, page 28.

of his defence, by any who shall have the curiosity to call at her house in *Great Wild-street, Lincoln's-Inn-Fields*, to converse with her, or who shall peruse the following certificate, which not only has her name signed to it, but is, in the strictest sense of the word, *her own*, both as to the stile, and as to the matter.

Great Wild-Street, Feb. 26, 1757.

UPON reading carefully over the postscript to the second part of Mr. *Bower's* answer to a scurrilous pamphlet, I have thought myself obliged, for the sake of truth, to declare what follows.----There never was any agreement between Mrs. *Sutton* and me, to leave Mr. *Bower* and her alone, although, as I supposed his intentions to be honourable, I should have had no scruple of doing it, had it been proposed, he having told me several times that he would marry her.

I do again repeat what I have attested formerly, that Mr. *Bower's* account of the rise of the Protestant religion was what gave me the first scruples; and as to the spiritual exercises used by the *Jesuits*, I did not then know what they were, and do not remember to have heard what they were till after my conversion. And I do not remember any particular conversation about religion with Mrs. *Sutton*; and as to Mrs. *Sutton's* bringing me acquainted with a priest, as Mr. *Bower* says, it is false, because the priest who received me into the church was of Mr. *Bower's* own pointing out, and the occasion was as follows. I had heard Mr. *Bower* say to Mrs. *Sutton*, that he had met with his school-fellow, who had scolded him, and he said that he frequently went by my window. Upon this I desired him to shew him to me, which accordingly he did, and told me he was a priest, and as great a divine as any in *England*; and from that time I had a great inclination to get acquainted with him, which I did not by means of Mrs. *Sutton*, but by means of Mr. *Wogan*, a baker, my neighbour, whose house he often frequented. And I solemnly declare, that the scruples which Mr. *BOWER* gave me were the occasion of my being a Catholic; and this I frequently mentioned to my friends with gratitude and praise to Mr. *Bower*, for the blessings which

' I thought I had received by his means. And he may well
 ' call me a *filly woman* for being blinded so long with so
 ' good an opinion of a man, *who has since appeared in so*
 ' *bad a light*: as to what he says of my repeating my
 ' account of this affair *as a school-boy does his lesson*; it is
 ' the nature of truth to be consistent with itself; and this
 ' being the principal event of my life, and having had
 ' great uneasiness and reproaches from my friends, for the
 ' step which I took, this made a deep impresson upon my
 ' mind of many minute circumstances, which I can never
 ' forget.

' In answer to what Mr. *Bower* has said of the improba-
 ' bility of his applying to me, to know whether he might
 ' safely trust his money in the hands of the *Jesuits*, for an
 ' annuity, I do again declare it to be strictly true, with
 ' this circumstance, that *I spoke* to Mr. *Baker*, a gentleman
 ' of his own order, more than once upon the subject; and
 ' Mr. *Baker* seemed very backward about the matter; but
 ' at last, at Mr. *Hoyles* and my request, he introduced him
 ' to Mr. *Shirburn*, and Mr. *Bower* himself, as I attested
 ' formerly, told me they had taken his money.

' To the best of my remembrance and belief, Mrs. *Sut-*
 ' *ton* never had my key but once, and that, so far as I can
 ' be sure of any thing so trifling, at this distance of time,
 ' was before Mrs. *Sutton* told me that Mr. *Bower* was a
 ' knight of *Malta*, and could not marry; I being very un-
 ' easy in my own mind, after I knew they could not mar-
 ' ry, that they should meet together, for his sake, seeing
 ' him so much in love with her. --- In answer to what he
 ' says about his employing my husband to print his receipts,
 ' by way of making him amends for some prints, which
 ' Mr. *Bower* says Mr. *Hoyles* gave him, I say that his me-
 ' mory must be very short; for it was my brother, and not
 ' Mr. *Hoyles* who gave him the prints; and I defy him to
 ' prove under my husband's hand, or any other way, that
 ' he had any more than the common price for printing a
 ' single thousand receipts, or any gratification of any kind
 ' from Mr. *Bower*; for Mr. *Hoyles* and I, never had any
 ' proofs of his generosity.

' So far was my husband's conversion from being owing, as
 ' Mr. *Bower* says, to my importunity, that I was cautious
 ' of beginning the subject of religion with him, as the step I
 ' had

* had taken was so disagreeable to him, but oftentimes when
 * Mr *Bower* came to visit us, *I took occasion to ask him questions*
 * *about religion before my husband, which Mr. Bower an-*
 * *swered seemingly with a great deal of pleasure ; and Mr.*
 * *Hoyles, to my great surprize, told me he was convinced*
 * *of the truth of the Catholic religion, and desired I*
 * *would apply to the same gentleman, Mr. Parkinson, who*
 * *had received me into the church, and who was the first*
 * *person who told me Mr. Bower was a priest. And so*
 * *far was my husband's conversion from arising from any*
 * *motive of interest, as Mr. Bower is pleased to say, that*
 * *he kept it private a great while, being afraid it would*
 * *be prejudicial to him ; and at that time my husband and*
 * *I knew no other Jesuit but Mr. Parkinson.*

* As to what Mr. *Bower* mentions, that he has, with-
 * in this twelvemonth, said much more to his Protestant
 * friends, in vindication of Popery unjustly accused, I am
 * certain that if he had only said as much as he said so fre-
 * quently and so pathetically to me, they would have really
 * conceived him to be a zealous Catholic as I did.

* And I do solemnly declare, that every thing contain-
 * ed in this certificate, and in the narrative published in
 * my name last summer, is true, as I shall answer it at the
 * great tribunal ; and as I am ready to confirm it, upon
 * oath, before any tribunal on earth.

HANNAH HOYLES.

After all the various and striking instances which have
 been produced to prove, that our hero, with all his pre-
 tensions to *moral honesty*, can have no pretensions to *credi-*
bility, even when his assertions stand uncontradicted, it is
 but natural to expect when the positive and circumstan-
 tial evidence of Mrs. *Hoyles* stands in direct opposition
 to him, that the reader should, without hesitation, pay a
 regard to it. But the credibility of Mrs. *Hoyles* is built
 upon a more solid foundation, than any defects in the cha-
 racter of the person against whom she has given her testi-
 mony. Though, therefore, I am sensible that it is now
 time to hasten to a conclusion, I must beg leave to produce
 here, in support of Mrs. *Hoyles*, the evidence of two pro-
 testants of character, one of whom greatly confirms the
 truth

truth of the *capital fact* which she relates, and both of whom give the highest attestation to her general good character. The persons I mean are Mr. *Faden*, the printer, and his wife. Mr. *Faden's* evidence had been appealed to, in my first pamphlet, and Mr. *Bower*, unable to confute it, slurs it over, in his last performance, with the slighting expression of being *bearsay*; and the evidence of Mrs. *Hoyles* over-again. (1) But he doth not tell his reader, that Mr. *Faden* speaks as to what he heard from Mrs. *Hoyles* above twenty years ago, when she spoke of *Bower* with all the warmth of friendship, and received him frequently as her visiter, many years before the *Popish plot*, which he talks of, was hatched against him, and consequently before she can be supposed to have had any temptation to depart from the truth. Mr. *Faden's* testimony must, upon this account, be looked upon, as of the utmost importance, and as such I have authenticated it, by procuring the following declaration from him, the original of which, I preserve, to be deposited, at a proper time, with the rest of the vouchers relating to this controversy, in some public library.

Wine-Office-Court, Jan. 24, 1757.

‘ MR. *Faden* declares, that he has known Mrs. *Hoyles* from the year 1733; that he believes her to be a woman of great charity, integrity, and veracity; that he lodged with her in the beginning of the year 1734, to the death of the late queen, and often saw Mr. *Bower* visiting her at her house; and that Mrs. *Hoyles* has more than once declared to him, during that time, that Mr. *Bower* converted her to Popery. This account he declares himself, ready to confirm upon oath.

‘ WM. FADEN.’

Besides speaking to the point of the *conversion*, Mr. *Faden* having expressed himself in such high terms of Mrs. *Hoyles's* general character; as a proof that he is not singular

(1) Second Part, Page 29;

lar in this judgment (a judgment, which, indeed, all the neighbourhood will confirm) I shall close my evidence by producing the following certificate of Mrs. *Faden*, his wife.

January 24, 1757.

‘ MRS. *Faden* has known Mrs. *Hoyles* from the year 1727, at which time she believes she was a Protestant, and has drank tea at Mrs. *Hoyles*’s house several times with Mr. *Bower*, who was then in the family of Lord *Aylmer*. Mrs. *Faden* has reason to think Mrs. *Hoyles* is a person of great integrity, and would assert nothing but what is strictly true.

‘ H. FADEN.’

Had I been told, when I first undertook to *unmask* the Historian of the Popes, that in order to prove my point, there would be a necessity of writing a volume, rather than a few sheets, I should have thought this as improbable as that my antagonist should have attempted what he has attempted, to write elaborate defences of himself, in which truth was *demonstrated* to be a lie, and a genuine correspondence to be converted by chicane and sophistry into a *plain and palpable forgery*. The latter having happened, the public could not but expect from me, a full *confutation* of the material facts asserted in this strange man’s three pamphlets; a task which, I flatter myself, few will think I have not executed to the purpose. (1) And if, with all the inclination

(1) Mr. *Bower*, page 32 of his second part, having answered a charge which I had brought against him, of pretending, in a certain family, that he had never been a *Priest*, by saying, *that the lady must have misunderstood him, with respect to that point, or he her*; to convince his patrons how little ground there is for believing any thing he may say, I desire they will enquire into the real state of this matter, from the lady’s husband, whom I need not name to them, and whose principles and religion are well known; and they will learn from him, *that he was by*, and heard *Bower* account for his having been a *confessor*, without having ever *said Mass*, by telling him and

nation imaginable to keep this controversy within narrow bounds, I have been obliged to swell my present performance so much, the public will do me the justice to observe, from the fullness of *my page*, that I have not allowed my publisher to take any advantage of their curiosity. As I have never once deviated from my subject, or insisted upon any point, which hath not a visible connection with the principal debate, if Mr. *Bower's* impostures have furnished me with so many materials, who can help it? And as a proof that I consult brevity, as much as is consistent with doing justice to my subject, having now laid before the public all the *evidence* which hath come to my hands, I shall hasten to a conclusion, and detain the reader only while I take my leave of him in some form, and close the controversy with a few reflections, which I think I could not omit, without finishing it abruptly.

My modest antagonist tells us, (1) that he has no intention to trouble the world any more on this subject, and he desires the public not to give him *any more of their time and attention*. This is very artificial; but is it natural? When there was a plot against bishop *Sprat*, (2) and forgery was made use of to ruin that great prelate; conscious of his innocence, nay, acquitted honourably of the charge brought against him, he still persevered in tracing this hellish machination to the bottom; and this *was* natural. An honest man, under the circumstances which *Bower* pretends are *his* at present, far from desiring that the curtain might be dropt, would naturally say that he would not leave this subject, till he had proved his innocence, and *detected* the forgery. But the same reasons which induced Mr. *Bower* to postpone his defence for many months after he knew his accusation, have, no doubt, induced him to declare his intention now of saying no more, though much more might have been expected from innocence,

and his lady, that on certain great days, when there were many confessions to hear, *persons who were not priests were called in to act as supernumerary confessors*. I take this occasion of mentioning this instance of Mr. *Bower's* usual veracity, which I had omitted to take notice of in its proper place.

(1) Second Part, page 24.

(2) See his elegant relation of this in the *State Trials*.

cence. Perhaps he is conscious, that no sophistry can be so artful, no made-up tale so well told, as to impose upon those who will employ *their time and attention* in its examination.

As Mr. Bower, therefore, intends to *trouble the public no more on this subject*, the controversy between him and me must cease of course; because I also have no intention to continue it. (3) But my reason for having done with it, is very different from his. I think I have done enough, perhaps more than enough, to prove my point. I never proposed to write to those persons who are incurably blind: all I have aimed at was to place the object in a proper light, before those who can see. And having succeeded in this, I leave it to others to undertake the difficult task of pulling out the beam from the eyes of *those few* who can read all that hath been offered on this subject, and yet think *Archibald Bower* worthy of their protection.

Go on, then, most venerable of converts! in thy successful labours to defend the Protestant religion! undisturbed by any *scurrilous pamphlets*, unmolested by the unreasonable interruption of *Protestant Libellers*, untortured by any future act of a *Protestant Inquisition*, proceed in thy laudable occupation to vindicate the *spiritual exercises of the Jesuits, and other Jesuitical and Popish institutions, conducive to holiness!* Continue to defend the church of *Rome*, when *unjustly accused*, and, particularly, leave not, upon any occasion, unexposed, that Protestant misrepresentation of Popery, which calls the *Supremacy of the Pope* an article of *Catholic communion*. But amidst all your endeavours, to shew the sincerity of your conversion by such topics of conversation, let me presume to recommend some little caution, in *hazarding* the above truths. For should it ever happen again, that you entertain *filly women* (or men as *filly as filly women*) with such harangues; who can tell but that your hearers may conceive the same *filly scruples* with that *filly woman* Mrs. *Hoyle*, and instead of being confirmed in Protestantism, be converted to Popery? In which

N tinue

(3) The extreme insolence of *Bower* is remarkable, who tho' he has been all his life-time a hackney-scribbler and hireling to booksellers, talks, p. 24 of his second part, of my having an inclination to keep up this controversy, *for lucre!*

case, the proselytes you make to your *old* church by your *private lectures*, may outnumber those you have made to your *new* church, by your *public labours* as historians of the *Popes*. To the prosecution of this work you may now safely return; a work which will enrich our language with the treasures hidden, not in the *Vatican*, but in *Tillemont* and *Fleury*; and the learned collections of the latter, coming in proper place to succeed the former, will enable you to go on as you have begun, and to make the remaining volumes of your work as much *original* as those already published. And though there may be some *tasteless pedants* so unreasonable as to think that you should have *undergone the drudgery of reading a hundred folios*, (1) when you could save all that trouble, by translating one or two papists, your history of the Popes will, no doubt, be continued to be read and admired by the same persons, who shall continue to countenance and protect its author, even after they shall have perused this *confutation*.

And here I am led, naturally, to take some notice of a charge brought against me by *Bower*, *That I abuse his patrons and friends*. Who those *friends and patrons* are whom I am said to abuse, I know not; but this I know, and this any one may see with his own eyes, that in my first pamphlet I speak a language very different from that of *Abuse*, when I pay the highest compliments to *one of his Patrons* (2) whom I had principally in my view, when, with a candor, which deserved a different treatment from what I have met with, I bore this testimony, *that Bower's patrons would not have honoured him with their friendship, if they had not thought him the man of truth and religion*. (3) If, in the prosecution of this debate, incidents have happened to inflame it, I know not who are most to be blamed---He, who when he *knew* that he had been most *injuriously* censured for doing what he thought was his duty, shewed that he was *capable* of expressing a *proper* resentment; or *they* who had *no motives* for such censures, (which I know have been liberally bestowed upon me) but that I had been instrumental in bringing to light a scene of imposture, the proofs of which were as *strong*, as the danger of it was *alarming*.

(1) See Bower's answer to a new charge, page 20.

(2) See the six letters illust. p. 9.

(3) See ditto, page 91.

If the friends of this man think it their duty to be indefatigable in defence of a character, which they have long been taught to revere, let them not blame others, who from motives at least as strong and as disinterested, have formed a very different opinion; and who, uninfluenced by resentment, as they have been *unbiass'd* by friendship, have looked upon the detection of the Historian of the Popes, as an object worthy of the attention of this Protestant nation. Ten artful *Jesuits*, assuming such a character as *Bower* now pretends to, and, under favour of such a disguise, equally successful with *Bower* in *insinuating* themselves into the confidence of Protestants, may do more real harm to our constitution in church and state, than an hundred declared emissaries of *Rome*. And if, in spite of all the variety of evidence, which hath demonstrated the truth of the charge against this Man he shall be so fortunate as to find protection, I need not point out to my readers, how wide a door we shall open to the sly arts of Popery, ever watchful to advance its interests amongst us; and what encouragement we shall give the *Papists* to send out other *Comminses*, and other *Heaths*, who may wear the mask of friendship to destroy more effectually, and be *Protestant Historians*, or any thing else, to carry on the designs of *Popery*.

Let me, therefore, before I take my leave of the subject, earnestly beg those few worthy persons, whom Mr. *Bower* still numbers amongst his friends, and whose good opinion I should be proud to obtain (surely I have done nothing to forfeit it) to consider seriously the tendency of their conduct, and to reflect, that if their protection of this man, *hitherto*, hath been a debt due to *friendship*, there are also other calls upon them. There is a debt due from them to the cause of *truth*; there is a debt due from them to the *public*, which hath been insulted; there is a debt due from them to the *Protestant religion*, which may be endangered. That they have so long dissented from the voice of the impartial public, hath not been owing (such is my opinion of their worth) to any backwardness to admit the truth; but hath arisen, no doubt, from the artful contrivances, and various frauds, made use of *daily* by a man, to whose word they have unhappily paid more regard than to *real evidence*; and whose low *cunning* hath enabled him to find out some pretence why *they* should believe him innocent, while *every body*

else thinks him guilty. -- But the *fastination*, surely, cannot last any longer; and if Mr. *Bower*'s friends should say, what few persons who are judges of evidence will say, that they perused *candidly* my two former pamphlets, without finding any reason to change their opinion; such is my confidence in their *abilities* to discover truth, and such my persuasion of their *inclination* to discover it, that, I flatter myself, they will, upon perusing this *confutation*, begin to think they may be in the wrong, and instead of blaming others for an opinion founded on the *solid evidence of facts*, will wonder that they themselves should have so long mistaken their object, and bestowed the rewards due only to *innocence and virtue*, as one who has no claim but to the infamy due to *hypocrisy and imposture*.

Not can it be any disgrace to those, who have hitherto believed *Bower* to be innocent, to own their mistake, upon the perusal of fresh evidence of his guilt. On the contrary such a step will do them honour. For an error in judgment, in one particular instance, doth not argue a general defect of understanding; and to acknowledge a mistake, always displays uprightness of heart, without inferring weakness of head. Mr. *Bower*'s patrons need not, therefore, be ashamed to say, that they have been under a delusion; for they who best deserve to escape the snares of artifice, are most likely to be entangled; and he who endeavours to live for the good of others, must always be exposed to arts of those who live only for themselves.

However, if any of the friends and patrons of this uncommon man, should still remain blind to his character, and averse to do justice to my views in stripping him of the disguises under which he hath so long concealed himself, I shall have little reason to regret their *undeserved* censures. For besides that I have no grounds for being dissatisfied with the judgment of the public in general, as to this controversy, I can say with pleasure, that the part which I have acted in it, far from injuring me with those friends, whose good opinion I could wish never to forfeit, hath been the means of recommending me to the *unsolicited*, and therefore the *generous* protection of many learned and worthy persons, upon this occasion, persuaded, as they were, that I engaged in the detection of *Bower*, from an abhorrence of iniquity, and with an honest view

to serve the public, by *exposing it*; and convinced, by the evidence which I produced, that this nation had not been more shamefully imposed upon as to the merits of the *History of the Popes*, than it had been as to the *real character* of its author.

But besides being able to boast of the approbation of learning and candor, I have it equally in my power to boast of the pleasing satisfaction of self-approbation; conscious as I am that, in this matter, I have done nothing but what, as a *lover of truth*, and as a *sincere Protestant*, I thought it my duty to do; and having nothing to reproach myself with, but, perhaps, that I did not, before I attempted to unmask imposture, *know*, what I have since discovered by experience, that *even* those who detest it equally with myself, may, by the arts of the *impostor*, be induced to go amazing lengths in its support.

Deeply impressed as my mind is with the clearest conviction of this man's guilt, and struck with horror to observe him pay no regard to the most *awful restraints*, in his attempts to conceal it; I cannot take my final leave without addressing myself to him, in the most serious and solemn manner, with a view not to *insult*, but to *reform*, not to harden him in his *impenitence*, but to rouse him, if possible, to thoughts of *amendment*. For however he may object to me malice and resentment, God is my witness, that I have a heart no stranger to those touches of humanity, which an honest man must feel upon seeing a fellow creature totally lost to every *virtuous affection*, and trampling under foot the *obligations of religion*. And this at time of life, when temptations begin to lose their force; when conscience usually resumes its influence even in breasts little accustomed to the throbs of *remorse*; and when the nearer prospect of the other world generally awakens the *infidel* from his impious disregard to offended heaven, and makes the *profligate* think seriously of atoning for the enormities of his life by the exemplariness of his death. May I therefore be indulged (I hope I may) to take my farewell of this unhappy man, by exhorting him, not with the cruelty of a *Montecuccoli*, but with the benevolence of a Christian, to give us some reason to believe that he is a *convert* to the first principles of religion, before he expects that we should pay any regard to his pretence of being a *convert*.

vert to Protestantism. Tho', after such proofs as I have produced of the genuineness of the *seven letters* to father *Sheldon*, it is now *too late* for him to hope that he can escape infamy amongst men, it is not *too late* for him to hope for forgiveness from God. Let me bend his stubborn nature to sincere sorrow, and instead of drawing down upon his head fresh vengeance, to beseech him, therefore, to employ the opportunities of repentance, still mercifully continued, so effectually, that posterity, when they read of *Archibald Bower*, the *Jesuit*, and of his attempts to deceive this *Protestant Nation*, may, for the honour of human nature, read at the same time, that he returned to the paths of virtue, and was, before he died, an *honest man*, and a *Christian*.

22 9 49

F I N I S.